



88001766

PB83-237248

Grazing Lease and Fee Arrangements of Western  
Governments and Agencies for Study of Western  
State, Local Governments, and Other Federal  
Agencies Grazing Leasing Arrangements and  
User Charges

Colorado State Univ., Fort Collins

Prepared for  
Forest Service, Washington, DC

29 Jun 83

HD  
241  
.B37  
1983

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
National Technical Information Service

**NTIS**<sup>®</sup>



# 12895801  
ID: 88001766

PB83-237248

HD  
241  
.B37  
1983

STUDY OF WESTERN STATES, LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, AND OTHER  
FEDERAL AGENCIES UNDER GRAZING ARRANGEMENTS AND USER  
CHARGES

GRAZING LEASE AND FEE ARRANGEMENTS OF  
WESTERN GOVERNMENTS AND AGENCIES

For

STUDY OF WESTERN STATE, LOCAL GOVERNMENTS,  
AND OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

GRAZING LEASING ARRANGEMENTS AND USER CHARGES

U.S. Forest Service  
Range Management Staff  
P.O. Box 2890, Fort Collins, CO 80523  
Washington, D.C. 20545

FINAL REPORT

For

USDA FOREST SERVICE  
CONTRACT NO. 53-31872-18

The Director of Range, Forest Service, and the Secretary of Agriculture are to report to Congress by June 1983, the results of a study of grazing arrangements and user charges to implement a five year survey of leasing arrangements and user charges identifying approximately 130 different agencies leasing grazing lands involving 40 state agencies, 70 local government agencies, and 17 federal agencies other than the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

Fee systems now being used by these governments and agencies are tested competitively against public sector competition with private grazing land lease rates, fee structures (including use of the range), compensation between the lessee and lessee, fees based on uses of grazing lands, grazing arrangements, and various combinations of the same. The report will be to help the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior recommend actions for their 1983 report.

E. T. Bartlett  
John R. McKean  
Wendell Winger

Submitted by:

Department of Range Science  
Colorado State University  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80523

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LIBRARY

Bureau of Land Management  
Denver, Colorado

Library  
Bldg.  
Denver, CO 80205



88001766

June 29, 1983

REPRODUCED BY  
NATIONAL TECHNICAL  
INFORMATION SERVICE  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

Department of Defense  
Defense Science Board  
Strategic Studies Center

<b>REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE</b>		<b>1. REPORT NO.</b>	<b>2.</b>	<b>3. Recipient's Accession No.</b>
				PB33 237248
<b>4. Title and Subtitle</b>		Study of Western States, Local Governments, and other Federal Agencies Grazing Leasing Arrangements and User Charges		
<b>7. Author(s)</b>		E. T. Bartlett, John R. McKean and Wendell Winger		
<b>9. Performing Organization Name and Address</b>		Department of Range Science Colorado State University Fort Collins, Colorado 80523		
<b>12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address</b>		USDA-Forest Service Range Management Staff P.O. Box 2417, Rm 610, RPE Washington, DC 20013		
<b>15. Supplementary Notes</b>				
<b>16. Abstract (Limit: 200 words)</b>		By December 31, 1985, the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture are to report to Congress "... their evaluation of the Public Rangelands Improvement Act (PRIA) fee formula, other grazing fee options, and their recommendations to implement a grazing fee schedule for the 1986 and subsequent grazing years." Survey of leasing arrangements and user charges identified approximately 130 different agencies leasing grazing lands including 44 State agencies, 71 local government agencies, and 17 Federal agencies other than the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM).  Fee systems now being used by these governments and agencies are sealed competitive bidding; public auctions; comparison with private grazing land lease rates, fee formulas (including use of the PRIA), negotiation between the lessor and lessee, fees based on costs of administration, custodial arrangements, and various combinations of the above. Use of the information by the Forest Service and BLM will be to help the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture develop recommendations for their 1985 report to the Congress.		
<b>17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors</b>		Grazing fees, Public Rangelands Improvement Act, Fee Formula, other fee options, grazing fee systems, Lease arrangements, User charges, lease terms and rights.		
<b>b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms</b>		1. Grazing Fee Statistics Summarized by Time Period 2. Grazing Fee Statistics Summarized by Non-Free Market Prices 3. Grazing Fee Statistics Summarized by Type of Agency		
<b>c. COSATI Field/Group</b>				
<b>Availability Statement:</b> No restriction on distribution Available from National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA 22161		<b>19. Security Class (This Report)</b> UNCLASSIFIED	<b>21. No. of Pages</b> 274	
		<b>20. Security Class (This Page)</b> UNCLASSIFIED	<b>22. Price</b>	

CLASSES £80

REF ID: A11925

1961 1st April

Traffic has discontinued from London mainland to your  
port from January until you have passed through Ingolstadt

and will resume on 1st April.

For the information of all

and others concerned.

SI-6741-18

## NOTICE

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED  
FROM THE BEST COPY FURNISHED US BY  
THE SPONSORING AGENCY. ALTHOUGH IT  
IS RECOGNIZED THAT CERTAIN PORTIONS  
ARE ILLEGIBLE, IT IS BEING RELEASED  
IN THE INTEREST OF MAKING AVAILABLE  
AS MUCH INFORMATION AS POSSIBLE.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Preface</b>	
<b>Introduction</b> . . . . .	1
<b>Methods</b> . . . . .	2
Agency Identification . . . . .	2
Data Collection . . . . .	2
Data Analysis . . . . .	3
Efficiency and Equity . . . . .	10
Updating Method . . . . .	11
<b>Results</b> . . . . .	12
Leasing Descriptions . . . . .	12
State Leases . . . . .	12
Local Leases . . . . .	17
Federal Agency Leases . . . . .	25
Comparative Analysis . . . . .	29
Explanatory Analysis . . . . .	35
Weighted Regression . . . . .	38
Equity/Efficiency Regressions . . . . .	38
Survey Updating Procedures . . . . .	44
Observations and Conclusions . . . . .	46
Glossary . . . . .	51
Appendices . . . . .	52
A. List of Agencies Leasing Grazing . . . . .	53
B. Grazing Lease Information . . . . .	68
C. Questionnaire . . . . .	155
D. Grazing Fee Formulas Used by State Land Agencies . . . . .	168
E. Grazing Fee Statistics Summarized by Type of Government . . . . .	173
F. Grazing Fee Statistics Summarized by State . . . . .	188
G. Grazing Fee Statistics Summarized by Fee Determination Method . . . . .	204
H. Grazing Fee Statistics Summarized by Tenant Rights . . . . .	219
I. Grazing Fee Statistics Summarized by Non-Free Market Proxies . . . . .	229
J. Grazing Fee Statistics Summarized by Type of Agency . . . . .	234
K. Forms for Updating Survey . . . . .	249



-35-

- 1 -

the accounted data and were improved by information obtained through the personal interview experiences.

## INTRODUCTION

In the Public Rangeland Improvement Act of 1978, Congress adopted the current fee formula based on the 1966 base rate of \$1.23 per Animal Unit Month (AUM) adjusted by the forage value index (FVI), the beef cattle price index (BCPI) and the prices paid index (PPI) (see Glossary for definition). This formula is to be used on a trial basis until 1985. PRIA also requires the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to prepare a study by 1985 which will evaluate the current fee formula, will examine other fee options, and will recommend a future fee system for 1986 and thereafter. Colorado State University contracted with USDA Forest Service (FS) and USDI Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to examine grazing lease and fee policies of governmental entities in 16 western states. This is the final report of that study which is one part of the overall grazing fee review and evaluation and will be used to evaluate other grazing fee options.

The grazing lease and fee policies study was conducted in three stages. Local, state, and federal agencies other than the FS and BLM that leased grazing were identified in the first stage of the study (Appendix A). The survey instrument was designed in the first stage. The second stage included the survey and the analytical design (Appendix A). The data analysis and final report constituted the final stage of the study.

## METHODS

### Agency Identification

An initial list of agencies that lease grazing was compiled through interviews of federal agencies such as the FS, BLM, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, National Park Service, and military in Washington, D.C. Letters were sent to all range extension agents of the states to determine other leasing agencies. Those identified were contacted by telephone to confirm leasing, and to expand the list. A postcard questionnaire was used to identify local governments. The compilation of the list of leasing entities constituted the first stage of the study with the collection methodology.

### Data Collection

Data collection constituted a major portion of the second stage. Data were collected on each agency concerning legal obligation of the agencies and lessee, duration of lease and tenure rights of lessee, rights of lessee to limit or exclude other uses, responsibility for quantity and seasonal distribution of grazing, range improvement expenditures and conditions, method of fee determination, rebates for range improvements and maintenance, expenditures and receipts from grazing programs, and history of lease and fee policy changes. An interview instrument was designed and pretested in Colorado (OMB No. 0596-0072, Expires October 31, 1983). The survey instrument is attached (Appendix C).

Virtually all state and federal agencies were visited and interviewed by a member of the research team. This personal contact with agency personnel greatly enhanced understanding of procedures employed by the agencies and allowed collection of a more accurate data base. Interpretations of

the acquired data set were improved by experience acquired through the personal interview experiences.

Because of budget constraints and diminishing returns to field work, most local agencies and several state and federal agencies were contacted by telephone. Data collection by telephone was accomplished after team members had acquired experience with in-person interviews and was greatly facilitated by this experience.

#### Data Analysis

Many factors can affect the process an agency uses to lease grazing lands. The size of leases administered, the number of leases administered, the intensity of grazing on acreage administered, the rights of the lessee in addition to grazing, the length of typical leases, the method of setting the grazing fee, and the intensity of management and adaptation of more efficient policies determine the leasing process and affect the grazing fee. Proxies for these listed variables which may affect fees were reported in Appendices I and II of the Stage II report (Appendix B). Statistical analyses of grazing fees may demonstrate relationships to these variables and may provide information which allows explanation of differences between grazing fees and provides insight to methods of allocating grazing land to private sector users. The statistical analyses included the mean and standard deviation as descriptive statistics, and testing explanatory models using regression and covariance analyses.

Statistical analyses of data such as those in Appendix B were accomplished using computer software packages such as "Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS)". Editing of data to eliminate non-comparable measures of variables insured a usable cross-sectional data set.

The first step in the analysis was to generate descriptive statistics for all variables for which data are collected. Means and standard deviations for all variables were computed. In addition, data were categorized by state, by agency, and by other appropriate categories and means and standard deviations were computed by category. These averages and dispersion measures were then compared and examined.

The second preliminary analysis was to be a test for correlations between all variables for more sophisticated testing procedures. Thus, a correlation matrix was to be computed, and all variables plotted against one another. However, because of incomplete information on many variables, this became impossible. Significant variables which were also commonly known by the agencies' personnel were examined in association with the regression analysis.

An analysis of fee rates using collected data was testing a model using regression analysis. The model was hypothesized as described in Table 1. It is important that it is clearly understood that this specification was only a hypothesis to be tested and not the result of an analysis or a conclusion of this study. This specification included the expected sign of the regression coefficient to be produced by the analysis.

To repeat, variables in this specification and the justifications below were chosen for testing purposes only; they did not represent conclusions of this study. Specifications of individual independent variables are justified below:

1. The regression coefficient for the number of acres per typical lease is specified with a negative sign. Larger leases indicate less intensive management by the administering agency.

TABLE 1: MODEL SPECIFICATIONS

Dependent Variable: \$Fee/AUM or \$Fee/Acre Grazed.

Independent Variables	Expected Sign	Expected Functional Form
1. Acres/Typical Lease	-	Linear
2. Number of Leases Administered by Agency	-	Quadratic
3. AUM/Acre	+	Linear
4. Other Rights Held by Lessee (e.g. vehicular access control); (Yes/No dummy)*	+	Linear
5. Length of Lease (Years)	+	Linear
6. {Length of Lease (Years)} X {First Right of Refusal (Yes/No dummy)}*	+	Linear
7. Rate Set by Board	0	Linear
8. Rate Set by Private Rates	+	Linear
9. Negotiated Rates (Yes/No dummy)*	-	Linear
10. Rate Formula Set	+	Linear
11. Rate Set by BLM or USFS Rates	-	Linear
12. State Wildlife Agency (Yes/No dummy) *	-	Linear
13. State Lands Agency (Yes/No dummy)*	-	Linear
14. State Park Agency (Yes/No dummy)*	-	Linear
15. Local Agency (Yes/No dummy)*	-	Linear
16. Federal Agency: BIA (Yes/No dummy)*	+	Linear
17. Federal Agency: BOR (Yes/No dummy)*	+	Linear
18. Federal Agency: USFWS (Yes/No dummy)*	+	Linear
19. Federal Agency: NPS (Yes/No dummy)*	+	Linear
20. Federal Agency: Military (Yes/No dummy)* (U.S. Corps of Engineers)	+	Linear

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Independent Variables	Expected Sign	Expected Functional Form
21. Lease Policy Change Since 1970 (Yes/No dummy)*	+	Linear
22. Range Improvements Contributed by Agency (\$)	+	Linear
23. Range Improvements Required by Agency (Yes/No dummy)*	-	Linear
24. Percent \$ Retained by Agency (%)	+	Linear
25. Agency Responsibility for Fence Maintenance (%)	+	Linear
26. Improvements in Lieu of Fee (\$)	+	Linear

\* Yes = 1 ; N = 0

2. The volume of leases administered is specified with a concave downward functional form. A small number of leases is not worth administering efficiently; as the number of leases increases the efficiency of management increases; and also a large number of leases attracts political pressures which reduce fee rates.
3. AUM/Acre (Glossary) is a proxy for the quality of the land grazed. Higher quality land should yield higher rates, thus a positive sign is specified.
4. Other rights such as control of access enhance value to the lessee, and thus result in higher fees and a positive coefficient.
5. The interaction of lease length with right of refusal or renewal provides a proxy for stability while allowing for older rates (lower rates) charged under old leases.
6. Rates set by bid are more competitive and therefore tend to be higher, yielding a positive sign on the regression coefficient.
7. Rates set by boards are attempts to set equitable rates but are subject to political pressure; the net result is, on the average, no impact on fees.
8. Rates based upon private rates are usually higher than other rates, thus a positive coefficient is specified.
9. Negotiated rates indicate that the agency is interested in something other than maximizing revenue, and thus a negative coefficient is specified.
10. Formula set rates represent an attempt to set efficient rates; thus these rates are higher.

11. BLM and USFS rates are often lower than other rates.
- 12-15. State and local agencies manage lands less intensively than federal agencies and are more susceptible to political pressure; the result is lower fees.
- 16-20. Federal agencies, except for the BIA, intensively manage lands in their trust; BIA leases partly to Indians and Indian tribes below market rates and this responsibility results in lower average rates on BIA managed lands.
21. Policy changes indicate intensive and current land management which results in higher fees.
22. Range improvements by administering agencies enhance value to lessees and result in higher rates.
23. Range improvements required by administering agencies are expensive to lessees and result in lower fee rates.
24. Monies retained by agencies provide an incentive to lease efficiently and maximize revenues; higher fees are consequential.
25. Agencies that maintain fences remove a burden from lessees and this results in higher fees.
26. Improvements in lieu of fees allows lessees to make necessary improvements to the land. This results in higher fees.

This multiple regression analysis produced a regression equation which, in theory, indicated the magnitude of influence of each particular independent variable on the grazing fee rate. Each parameter of the regression equations was tested for statistical significance. The influence of a particular independent variable on the dependent variable (fee rate) holding the simultaneous impact of all other included variables constant was derived. In

addition, the total effect of all variables was also measured; this measure showed the percent change in the dependent variable (fee rate) "explained" by the entire set of independent variables.

An attempt to enhance the above analysis was made by using the method of weighted least squares\*. All data values for variables collected from a given agency were divided (and thus weighted) by the number of animal unit months (or acres) administered by the agency. Thus, an attempt was made to accommodate differences in the size of agencies and differences in data aggregations by agencies.

A fourth and final analysis was proposed. This model, proposed to measure possible inequity or inefficiency, demonstrated the variables that best explain the relative difference between the actual fee and grazing Fair Market Values (FMV). Since fair market value cannot be measured directly, fair market value was alternatively measured by PRIA (1981), Forage Value Index (June Enumerative Study), and RPA Shadow Price (Gee). The JES and RPA shadow price provided the only data series available as surrogate measures of FMV. The JES is enumerated survey response that estimates the lease rate (\$/AUM) on privately owned nonirrigated land. This data series suffers from possible non-comparability to public grazing/leases and in some states fluctuations in the series occur due purely to sampling errors. The RPA shadow price is derived from linear programs of ranch models near each national forest. Although these values were not collected as a surrogate market value of forage because the shadow price measures only the returns to beef production, they provide yet another standard for comparison.

---

\* Johnston (1972) provides a complete explanation of weighted least squares.

By specifying the relative difference  $(\text{FMV} - \text{actual fee})/\text{FMV}$  as the dependent variable, the percentage difference of an agency's fee from the free market value was measured. To compare actual amounts  $(\text{FMV} - \text{actual fee})$  of this disparity would be misleading because lease rates vary drastically between states. For example, a \$2 difference may be a 50% difference for Nevada, but in Nebraska may only be a 20% difference. Thus, the percentage difference:  $(\text{FMV} - \text{actual fee})/\text{FMV}$  was used. Regressing this dependent variable on the variables listed in Table 1 was attempted to afford insight about the equity and efficiency of alternative leasing systems.

#### Efficiency and Equity

The theoretical economic concepts of equity and efficiency concern the extent to which a given leasing system produces outcomes which are fair to the lease-holder and to the public and allocate the leased land to its best use. In theory, each factor of production (in this case, forage) is most efficiently used when the incremental value derived from the last unit in production is equal to the market price for similar units. A pricing (leasing) system which distorts input costs misallocates resources causing economic waste. Misallocation of grazing inputs results in waste of the grazing input and waste of other resources used in compensation. The potential for theoretical economic inefficiency occurs when there is a disparity between the free market price and the agency lease rate.

The measure  $(\text{FMV} - \text{agency lease rate})/\text{FMV}$  is only an indicator of potential inefficiency since other factors may enter into the determination of the agency lease rate which could cause it to differ from private rates without violating the efficiency criterion. For example, if agency and rancher agree that the rancher accepts extra grazing costs above those normally included in private lease agreements, then a lease rate below

FMV is fully justified. However, if the disparity between the agency lease rate and FMV is the result of arbitrary agency lease policy not related to rancher cost or productivity differences, the economic efficiency is reduced. Regression analyses using  $(\text{FMV} - \text{agency fee})/\text{FMV}$  may provide insight about the existence or nature of inefficiencies and inequities.

#### Updating Method

The final step in the study was to design a method for updating information obtained in the study. Consideration was given to the relevance of the information and availability of the information. The design was done with the knowledge obtained in collecting the original data and the analyses. The updating method includes a questionnaire and recommended procedure to administer the questionnaire.

## RESULTS

Forty-four state agencies, 63 local governments, and 11 federal agencies were identified as currently leasing grazing in the 16 western states. Generally, one interview was made with each state and local agency while the number of interviews with federal agencies varied. Some leasing policy was set at the national level, some was set at the regional or district level, and in some cases, policy was made at the local office. Administration of federal grazing was done at the local or regional level although this varies between agency and within the same agency in some cases.

### Leasing Descriptions

Total acreage that was identified was approximately 52.7 million acres of which 547 thousand acres were irrigated. These figures are conservative as eight entities did not have records of acres grazed because grazing records were not kept separate from agricultural leases or they did not have records. In addition, several agencies were not interviewed because they were leasing less than 20 acres, contact could not be made, or they were uncooperative.

Agencies leased on both an AUM and acre basis. The total AUM's was approximately 7.15 million with an average fee of \$6.44 per AUM. Average fee per acre was \$7.76. Total receipts from grazing was 197 million dollars from approximately 53 thousand leases. The duration of the leases averaged just under four years.

State Leases: Of the state agencies, the most common was state land agencies. These occur in all states except Nevada and Kansas which do not have state school lands. Wildlife agencies were the next most frequent with 11, and then recreation oriented state agencies. Other agencies at the

state level included those that were responsible for both wildlife and recreation, forestry, water resources, and occasionally universities.

Thirty-seven of the 43 state agencies were interviewed because some agencies administer grazing for other agencies. Summary statistics are presented in Table 2. Details for each state agency were presented in Appendix I of the Stage II report. There were approximately 34,000 leases on a little over 41,000,000 acres of state land. In 1981, revenue was almost \$20 million. Most of the state land was not leased on an AUM basis, but rather on a per acre basis. However, approximately 17,000,000 acres were leased on an AUM basis and account for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  million AUM's. If this is extrapolated to the total 41 million acres, over 8 million AUM's are grazed on state lands.

The state land agencies administered 39 million or 96 percent of the total land leased (Tables 2 & 3). Seven states made up 35 million acres of this with New Mexico and Arizona accounting for approximately one-half of the 39 million acres. The charge per AUM ranged from \$1.43 in Arizona to \$14.00 in Nebraska. The most common method of determining the fee was by formula and the state land boards setting the fee. Individual formulas are presented in Appendix D.

The rancher was responsible for maintenance, and in fact, in many cases the lease states that the rancher will be the steward and protect the land from misuse by both himself and others. In state land agencies, there were two legal cases in which education associations have sued the state saying that the fee return was not resulting in fair market return. This has increased the fee in Arizona by an adjustment in the formula and was undergoing court determination in Oklahoma in 1982.

TABLE 2

SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR GRAZING  
LEASING FOR ALL STATE AGENCIES IN 1981

<u>State</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Leases</u>	<u>Leasees</u>	<u>Most Common Method of Fee Determination</u>
Arizona	8,775,023	1,270,000	1,565	1,450	Formula
California <sup>1/</sup>	130,625	No Record	59	*	Varies
Colorado	2,774,698	No Record	3,012	2,762	Board Set and Bids
Idaho	2,104,260	277,470	1,618	1,218	Varies
Kansas	8,092	3,608	6	6	Bids
Montana <sup>2/</sup>	4,272,106	*	6,325	*	Bids and Formula
Nebraska	1,236,349	*	887	*	Board Set and Formula
Nevada	91,986	6,502	6	13	Bids
New Mexico	11,022,097	*	5,513	*	Formula
North Dakota	718,450	*	2,460	1,660	*
Oklahoma	625,000	650,000	800	700	Formula
Oregon	692,039	78,063	311	309	Varies
South Dakota	845,305	331,779	3,082	1,596	Formula
Utah	3,065,453	*	2,562	2,408	Board Set
Washington	1,056,531	*	1,914	*	Formula
Wyoming	3,700,073	939,667	3,967	2,596	Formula
Total	41,119,087	*	34,087	*	

<sup>1/</sup> Does not include California Department of Fish and Game

<sup>2/</sup> Does not include Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks

\* Indicates that some agencies in the states do not have this information so totals become meaningless

TABLE 3

SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR STATE LAND BOARDS, AND  
STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS, LEASING GRAZING IN 1981

<u>State</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Determination Method</u>	<u>Fee \$/AUM</u>	<u>Receipts</u>	<u>Maintenance Responsibility</u>
Arizona	8,775,023	1,269,840	Formula	1.43	\$1,482,822	Rancher
California	92,877	3,300	Varies	1.70	\$ 10,300	Rancher
Colorado	2,724,698	No Record	Board Set	3.00	1/	Rancher
Idaho	2,090,000	274,000	Bids & Board Set	4.25	\$ 893,983	Rancher
Montana	4,090,430	No Record	Formula	3.47	\$4,587,131	Rancher
Nebraska	1,235,346	No Record	Board Set	14.00	1/	Rancher
New Mexico	10,962,097	No Record	Formula	1.60	\$3,013,660	Rancher
North Dakota	705,000	No Record	Auction	---	\$1,000,000 <sup>2/</sup>	Rancher
Oklahoma	625,000	650,000	Formula	5.70	\$3,700,705	Rancher
Oregon	607,916	56,095	Board Set, PRIA <sup>3/</sup>	2.50	\$ 193,284	Rancher
South Dakota	845,305	331,779	Formula	2.23/ acre	\$1,384,872	Rancher
Utah	2,814,726	153,000	Board Set	2.36	\$ 85,000 <sup>2/</sup>	Rancher
Washington	885,638	No Record	Varies <sup>4/</sup>	3.37	\$ 337,294	Rancher
Wyoming	3,614,887	931,779	Formula	1.65	\$1,537,435	Rancher
Total	39,364,648	---			---	

1/ Grazing receipts are included with other agricultural leases

2/ Estimate by interviewee

3/ PRIA formula was \$2.31/AUM in 1981

4/ Auctions and bids are held with a formula determining minimum bid

TABLE 4

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND NUMBER OF  
OBSERVATIONS ON GRAZING FEE VARIABLES FOR STATE LAND AGENCIES

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Improvement Expenditures (\$)	36,698.00	60,617.78	9
Free Market Value	.69	.48	13
AUM/Acre	.27	.33	8
Dollars/AUM (\$)	4.47	3.60	10
Dollars/Acre (\$)	.22	.0	1
Total Acres	3,014,100.38	3,317,710.43	13
Irrigated Acres	36,043.00	85,554.81	12
Total AUM's	458,724.13	452,217.23	8
Number of Leasees	1,812.27	1,505.68	11
Number of Leases	2,422.77	1,871.50	13
Lease Duration (Years)	8.31	2.36	13
Total Revenue (\$)	1,656,072.91	1,487,885.68	11

State wildlife agencies accounted for about two-thirds of a million acres or 1.6 percent of state lands with much of this in Washington, Utah, Nevada, Oregon, and New Mexico (Tables 5 & 6). The rates here were higher than for state land boards, ranging from \$4 to \$11.00 per AUM. Leases were usually made on a competitive bid basis, and maintenance was shared by the wildlife agencies and the lessees. The policy towards grazing varies. It is either grazing to manage for wildlife habitat, or in some cases, the agency has been mandated to allow grazing to generate income and also to allow the former owner of the land to graze.

State recreational agencies were the next most frequent, but they only accounted for a half of one percent of the total state lands in the sixteen western states. The fee varied from \$1.65 to \$6.25 per AUM and was not commonly determined by bids (Tables 7 & 8). In most cases, the rancher was responsible for maintenance. There was one case in Nevada where grazing is done just to show livestock tradition within the park.

Other state agencies that lease grazing included two forestry agencies (Montana, Oregon), a water resource agency (California) and the University of California at Berkeley (Table 9). Both forestry agencies leased on an AUM basis as did the University of California. The water resource agency leased on a per acre basis which varied by lease. The California Department of Water Resources was leasing around water projects, and grazing capacity varied from year to year depending on precipitation. In all four agencies the rancher was responsible for maintenance.

Local Agencies: Almost all local agencies that leased grazing were associated with water, either water districts or city governments that had

TABLE 5  
SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR STATE WILDLIFE  
AGENCIES LEASING GRAZING IN 1981

<u>State</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Determination Method</u>	<u>Fee \$/AUM</u>	<u>Receipts</u>	<u>Maintenance Responsibility</u>
California	1/	1/				Rancher
Colorado	50,000	2,500	Bids	8.00	\$ 20,000	Shared
Idaho	4,800	3,470	Bids	8.50	\$ 14,640	Shared
Kansas	8,092	3,608	Bids	10.21	\$105,808	Shared
Montana	1/	1/	Bids	11.00	1/	Shared
Nebraska	1,003	495	Negotiated	6.45	\$ 2,731	Rancher
Nevada	91,045	4,816	Bids	4.00	\$ 11,600	Rancher
New Mexico	60,000	1/	Bids	5.00	1/	Rancher
North Dakota	13,450	1,470	Private Rates	7.00	\$ 22,817	Shared
Oregon	79,921	21,875	Prvt. Rts. and Formula	5.84	\$127,907	Shared
Utah	140,174	No Record	Bids, Formula	5.44	\$ 37,805	Agency
Washington	163,715	13,049	Varies	4.25	\$ 48,968	Rancher
Wyoming	54,347	7,389	Bids	11.00	\$ 70,868	Shared
Total Area	666,547					

1/ Interviewee failed to respond with this information

TABLE 6

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND NUMBER OF  
OBSERVATIONS ON GRAZING FEE VARIABLES FOR STATE WILDLIFE AGENCIES

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Improvement Expenditures (\$)	10,759.64	22,307.99	11
Free Market Value	.73	.47	11
AUM/Acre	.26	.24	9
Dollars/AUM (\$)	6.59	2.20	12
Total Acres	62,466.67	61,114.22	9
Irrigated Acres	4,400.70	8,031.85	10
Total AUM's	6,519.11	6,872.12	9
Number of Leasees	28.30	25.94	10
Number of Leases	26.91	25.05	11
Lease Duration (Years)	2.00	1.29	13
Total Revenue (\$)	46,314.40	42,467.79	10

TABLE 7  
SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR STATE  
RECREATION AGENCIES LEASING GRAZING IN 1981

State	Acres	AUMs	Fee Determination Method		Receipts	Maintenance Responsibility
			Private Rates	\$/AUM		
California	26,822	No Record	Private Rates	5.30/Acre	\$156,319	Rancher
Idaho	9,460	No Record	Bids	5.00	\$ 49,856	Rancher
Nevada	941	1,686	Bids	5.30	\$ 15,255	Rancher
Utah	110,553	No Record	Bids	6.25	\$ 12,752	Rancher
Washington	7,158	751	Bids	3.15	\$ 2,010	Rancher
Wyoming	<u>30,839</u>	7,499	Board Set	1.65	\$ 12,373	Rancher
Total	185,793					

TABLE 8

local agencies, 40 MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND NUMBER OF

could not be contacted. OBSERVATIONS ON GRAZING FEE VARIABLES

were uncooperative. FOR STATE PARK AND RECREATION AGENCIES

about 610,000 acres (Table 10). The fee determination method for local

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Improvement Expenditures (\$)	316.80	708.39	5
Free Market Value	.75	.46	8
AUM/Acre	.66	.77	4
Dollars/AUM (\$)	5.65	2.67	7
Dollars/Acre (\$)	5.30	0	1
Total Acres	26,685.14	38,838.68	7
Irrigated Acres	470.75	1,136.04	8
Total AUM's	2,607.75	3,300.77	4
Number of Leasees	16.67	16.55	6
Number of Leases	18.71	16.86	7
Lease Duration (Years)	5.38	4.07	8
Total Revenue (\$)	35,899.43	55,467.39	7

some of the other types of agencies. Eight percent of the tenants had all rights, 47% had first right of refusal, 25% leased on an equal basis, and 6% had a combination of the other three. In approximately half of the cases, the local governments considered other factors than obtaining fair market value. An example is that some local governments lease grazing in order to obtain a caretaker for the land. The tenant received rights in addition to grazing from approximately one-half of the local governments.

TABLE 9  
SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR OTHER STATE  
AGENCIES LEASING GRAZING IN 1981

	<u>Acres</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Fee Determination Method</u>	<u>\$/AUM</u>	<u>Receipts</u>	<u>Maintenance Responsibility</u>
California						
Univ. of California	2,000	463	Private Rates	8.00	\$ 3,704	Rancher
Dept. of Water Resources	8,926	No Record	Negotiated Bids, Auctions Private Rates	1/	\$ 42,710	Rancher
Montana						
Division of Forestry	181,676	14,930	Bids and Formula	3.47	\$ 58,626	Rancher
Oregon						
Department of Forestry	4,202	93	Private Rates and PRIA	2.25	\$ 209.25	Rancher
Total	196,804					

- 
- 1/ Bids averaged \$10.76 per acre and leases based on private rates averaged \$15.00 per acre.  
2/ PRIA rate was \$2.31 per AUM in 1981.

watersheds or land on which the city had rights for ground water. Of the 63 local agencies, 48 were interviewed; others were not interviewed because they could not be contacted, they leased less than 20 acres, or in some cases, they were uncooperative. There were 326 leases from these local governments on about 610,000 acres (Table 10). The fee determination method for local governments is highly variable, but the most common is competitive bids and public auction (45% of governments). Other methods used to determine grazing rates included negotiation (17%), private lease rates (13%), and formulas (9%). Other methods included fees based on board determination, PRIA rates, and break-even rates. Six percent did not know the basis for the fee.

Range maintenance varied, but the rancher was totally responsible in 77% of the cases. The agency did all of the maintenance in only 9% of the cases, while in the other 15% the agency and rancher shared maintenance. Only 9 agencies had range improvement expenditures while 34 had none. Five agencies had no records on range improvement expenditures. Five of the agencies gave rebates for range improvements, but only one respondent knew the amount.

Tenure on local government lands varied but was more permanent than on some of the other types of agencies. Eight percent of the tenants had all rights, 47% had first right of refusal, 35% competed on an equal basis, and 6% had a combination of the other three. In approximately half of the cases, the local governments considered other factors than obtaining fair market value. An example is that some local governments lease grazing in order to obtain a caretaker for the land. The tenant receives rights in addition to grazing from approximately one-half of the local governments.

TABLE 10

SUMMARY STATISTICS (STATE TOTALS) FOR LOCAL  
GOVERNMENTS LEASING GRAZING IN 1981

<u>State</u>	<u>No. of Governments Identified</u>	<u>Number Interviewed</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Receipts<sup>9</sup>/</u>
California	26	20	523,301	118,169 <sup>1</sup> /	2,053,870
Colorado	7	6 <sup>2</sup> /	16,707	1,450 <sup>3</sup> /	66,090
Idaho	2	2	501	140 <sup>4</sup> /	1,500
Nebraska	6	5	4,199	90 <sup>5</sup> /	41,100
Nevada	2	2	36,000	15,000 <sup>6</sup> /	65,551
New Mexico	3	3	4,914	200 <sup>7</sup> /	4,025
Oregon	2	2	683	943 <sup>8</sup> /	4,120
South Dakota	9	2	220	No Record	2,260
Washington	5	5	3,167	No Record	2,946
Wyoming	1	1	20,095	No Record	983
Total	63	48	609,787		\$2,242,445

<sup>1</sup>/ AUM records available from only 8 local governments in California

<sup>2</sup>/ The cities of Greeley and Fort Collins lands are administered cooperatively

<sup>3</sup>/ Only Boulder, Colorado had AUM records

<sup>4</sup>/ Only Lewts-Orchards Irrigation District had AUM records

<sup>5</sup>/ Only Lower Big Blue NRD had AUM records

<sup>6</sup>/ Only Pershing County Water Conservation District had AUM records

<sup>7</sup>/ Only Arch Hurley Conservation District had AUM records

<sup>8</sup>/ Only City of Metford had AUM records

<sup>9</sup>/ Not all governments had records on grazing receipts

Federal agencies: Eleven federal agencies leased grazing on 257 sites in the western United States, and had 2,358 leases. Total acreage on land administered by federal agencies was over 12.6 million acres (Table 11). The Agricultural Research Service leases grazing in Colorado, Oklahoma, and New Mexico. A total of 19,900 AUM's from 165,000 acres was leased at a rate of \$4.17 to \$5.70 per AUM. Each site used a different method to determine the fee. One used a formula, one based the fee on private rates, and one used the fee charged on the adjacent National Grassland. These leases were special cases because the purpose of the leases was to obtain animals for research. The rancher provided the animals and all management was provided by the ARS.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers administers the leases for the Air Force, Army, and the Corps. The Air Force had a total of 87,102 acres, the Army 421,241 acres, and the Civil Works 155,492 acres. The military leases were done on a basis of attaining additional funds where possible and were to obtain fair market value for the grazing. Almost exclusively, leases were determined by competitive bid, and many had grazing plans associated with them. In many of the areas, particularly California, those that were not based on grazing plans in AUM's were being changed to include a grazing plan and an AUM capacity. The military also gave rebates in lieu of improvement work by the lessee in order to increase the range improvement level.

The Civil Work areas were leased by competitive bids. Most of these were on a per acre basis because the areas are often flooded and the capacity is never determined until that particular year. The rate of grazing greatly varied particularly due to the fact that many of these areas only had one land holder that had access to a particular portion of land. The rancher was responsible for maintenance of range improvements.

TABLE 11  
SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR FEDERAL  
AGENCIES LEASING GRAZING IN 1981

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Sites</u>	<u>AUMs-<sup>1</sup>/with AUM Records</u>	<u>Sites</u>	<u>Fee Determination Method</u>	<u>Maintenance Responsibility</u>
Agricultural Research Service	165,735	3	19,920	3	Varies	Agency
U.S. Air Force	87,102 <sup>2</sup> /	11	18,265	3	Bids	Rancher
U.S. Army	421,241	18	57,463	6	Bids	Rancher
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	155,492	46	3,610	5	Bids	Rancher
U.S. Navy and Marines	85,818	7	23,632	7	Bids	Rancher
Bureau of Indian Affairs	7,900,841 <sup>3</sup> /	40	1,887,568	16	Bids & Private Rates	Varies/Shared to Rancher
Bureau of Reclamation	230,556	57	8,011	4	Varies	Varies/Shared to Rancher
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	1,987,569	56	264,723	53	Private Rates	Varies/All Agency to all Rancher
National Park Service	1,606,651	18 <sup>4</sup> /	81,752	16	PRIA	Varies/Shared to Rancher
U.S. Coast Guard	255	1	No Record	-	Private Rates	Agency
Total	12,641,260	257	2,364,944	113		

<sup>1</sup>/ Not all sites had AUM records

<sup>2</sup>/ Includes a 40,345 acre/case for a Federal prison; other columns do not include this lease

<sup>3</sup>/ Not all sites had acreage records

<sup>4</sup>/ Grant Kohrs Ranch National Historic Site has no records

The Navy and the Marines had approximately 85,000 acres which provided 23,600 AUM's of grazing. Much of this was in California, but all was administered from San Bruno, California. The lease rate was based on competitive bid, and management requirements were contained in the Range Management Plan. The Navy was one of the few agencies in which the range improvement investments exceeded grazing income in 1981. Rebates were given for range improvement work; the rancher was responsible for maintenance. The average grazing fee on the 85,000 acres was \$11.34 per AUM.

Bureau of Indian Affairs administers grazing in most states in the west; the total was almost 8 million acres. In the northern plains, they issued permits to non-tribal members when grazing was not wanted by the tribe or tribal members. These were based on AUM's and have management plans which were determined by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

There were two types of leases. First, in the northern plains, leases were made to tribal members, but elsewhere, leases were made to non-tribal members. On leases to non-tribal members, the fee was primarily determined by bid and private rates. Maintenance was almost always by the rancher, but some improvements were funded by the agency. The purpose of the leasing program to non-tribal members was to generate income for the tribe or individual tribal members.

The Bureau of Reclamation leased grazing around its projects and on land that had been withdrawn but not used by the Bureau. The fee was determined by competitive bid and comparison to private rates. There was little done beyond administration of the leases. Lessees competed on an equal basis when the lease expired. The leases, by national policy, were

for one year with an option for four. The Bureau of Land Management administers much of the withdrawn land just as it would its own.

The National Park Service leased land for grazing in 18 national parks and monuments. This covered 1.6 million acres and provided 81,750 AUM's of grazing. The most common method of fee determination was to use the PRIA formula. There were two exceptions: Point Reyes National Seashore and Whitman Mission Historic Site in Washington where fees were based on private rates. In many cases, grazing was required in the agreement when the park was established, and individual parks may be phasing the grazing out depending on the establishing agreements. Maintenance responsibility varied from all rancher to shared work by the agency and rancher.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service administers grazing on 56 of its refuges or game ranges in the west. The 265,000 AUM's were obtained from almost 2 million acres. The fee was usually based on private rates, although there were some instances of formula being used, using PRIA rates, or negotiating. Maintenance was a joint responsibility with the Fish and Wildlife Service usually maintaining the exterior fences and the rancher responsible for any interior fences. Improvements were allowed in some cases; however, usually most of the fences were already there and water was not a problem. In fact, on some refuges no improvements were allowed in the lease. The purpose of the grazing was to manage habitat. There have been changes in national policy for grazing. The present policy is to use grazing if you can generate additional income as long as it is consistent with the mission of the agency.

The final agency to lease grazing was the U.S. Coast Guard of the Department of Transportation. It has 255 acres which lease for \$22.50 per acre in California. Rates were based on comparison with private rates.

### Comparative Analysis

The information on grazing leases and fees by state, local, and federal agencies (except BLM and FS) were summarized in several ways in order to allow comparisons. The purpose of this comparative analysis was to present differences and similarities in the grazing fee systems and fee charges. This information would then be used by personnel of the agencies to evaluate and judge the worth of different systems.

Table 12 shows statistics by state without respect to type of government leasing grazing. The amount of grazing land leased in each state generally followed the amount of state land within each state. Two of the states (California and North Dakota) with the highest AUM totals tend to have higher carrying capacities. They also have higher mean rental per acre (means calculated on the basis of number of agencies leasing grazing in a particular state). Arid states and states with high proportions of public lands tended to have lower mean grazing fees.

Of the survey values for state and local agencies, only Arizona had a rate (\$1.43) lower than the PRIA formula in 1981 (\$2.31).

The fees in each state by state agency and local agency were compared to the 1982 RPA grazing values and 1981 June Enumerative Survey (JES) values (Table 13). RPA values averaged \$10.41 for the western states (excluding Oklahoma) and JES values averaged \$8.70. In almost all cases the RPA and JES values were higher than the average agency values. The magnitude of that difference changed from state to state. In Arizona RPA and JES values were over 6 times as great as Arizona state agencies. In Idaho this ratio was less than 2. Kansas state agency grazing fee exceeded the JES value slightly, but was well over 7 times greater than the RPA value. The RPA value was for a National Grassland in southwestern Kansas.

TABLE 12

ACRES, LEASES, AUM'S AND AVERAGE LEASE RATES BY STATE REGARDLESS  
OF TYPE OF AGENCY

<u>State</u>	<u>Total Acres</u>	<u>Total # Leases</u>	<u>Total # AUMs</u>	<u>Mean \$1/ Per AUM</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>
Arizona	8,838,196	1,461	1,272,581	5.99	6.46
California	856,930	340	1,265,093	9.21	4.93
Colorado	3,022,064	2,823	29,222	4.92	1.73
Idaho	2,218,766	1,279	300,986	6.20	3.51
Kansas	32,968	61	7,408	5.74	2.80
Montana	7,312,259	3,115	647,042	5.88	2.49
Nebraska	1,299,663	48	20,929	8.47	3.28
Nevada	419,047	65	46,644	3.04	1.26
New Mexico	12,606,159	7,694	2,790	4.41	2.83
North Dakota	3,045,135	3,124	1,212,967	6.63	.25
Oklahoma	1,404,767	2,339	658,828	4.98	2.55
Oregon	1,420,835	375	170,678	5.41	3.24
South Dakota	889,004	1,824	340,260	7.76	1.53
Utah	3,263,378	2,410	158,670	6.59	4.17
Washington	2,338,875	186	59,383	5.28	2.78
Wyoming	3,733,218	2,611	954,989	7.00	0.00
INCLUDED POPULATION	52,701,264	29,755	7,148,470	6.44	3.79

1/ Means are averages by agencies and are not weighted by AUM's.

TABLE 13  
MEAN GRAZING FEES OF STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES BY STATE,  
1982 RPA GRAZING VALUES AND 1981 JUNE ENUMERATIVE SURVEY (JES) VALUES  
FEE COMPARISONS

Type of Agency	<u>State or Agency</u>	\$/AUM Survey Fees (1981)	\$/AUM RPA (1982)	\$/AUM JES (1981)
State Agencies	Arizona	1.43	8.90	9.40
	California	5.50	10.41	10.48
	Colorado	5.50	10.29	8.20
	Idaho	4.92	8.01	8.20
	Kansas	10.21	1.32	9.06
	Montana	5.98	11.39	9.40
	Nebraska	9.94	10.05	13.81
	Nevada	4.63	14.51	6.29
	New Mexico	4.15	8.56	6.98
	North Dakota	7.00	11.21	8.89
Local Agencies	Oklahoma	5.70	---	5.88
	Oregon	3.40	10.31	7.54
	South Dakota	5.06	12.39	11.97
	Utah	4.68	11.77	7.24
	Washington	3.59	11.69	8.18
	Wyoming	7.00	10.10	7.93
	California	8.39	10.41	9.40
Local Agencies	Colorado	5.38	10.29	10.48
	Nevada	4.50	14.51	6.29
	New Mexico	3.00	8.56	6.98
	Oregon	8.22	10.31	7.54
	South Dakota	6.22	12.39	11.97
	Washington	4.00	11.69	8.18

The difference between RPA and JES values and survey values are shown in Table 14. The mean difference between RPA values and survey values was \$4.58 while the mean difference between JES values and survey values was \$3.13. The mean ratio of the difference between RPA and survey values to RPA values was .17. This means that RPA values averaged 20% higher than survey values. JES values averaged 35% higher than survey values. The average difference between the RPA and survey values was reduced by the low RPA value for Kansas.

The most frequent method of determining the grazing fee was sealed bids (Table 15). This frequency is based on the number of agencies or sites within agencies in the federal agencies that use each method. The frequency may sum to over 1.00 since some agencies or sites use more than one method. The next most common method was comparison with private rates while the remainder were much less used. For state agencies, sealed bids and formulas were the most frequently used methods while for local governments the sealed bid method was the most common. Other variables are compared by fee determination methods in Tables in Appendix G.

Other appendices compare different variables by different methods of classification. Total acres, revenue, AUM's, AUM's per acre, dollars per AUM and per acre, number of leases and lessees, lease duration, improvement expenditures, fair market value and other leasing considerations are compared on the basis of type of government (Appendix E), state (Appendix F), tenant rights (Appendix H), non-free market proxies (Appendix I), and type of agency (Appendix J).

Explanatory Analysis

TABLE 14

DIFFERENCES OF GRAZING FEES OF STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES  
BY STATE AND 1982 RPA GRAZING VALUES AND 1981 JUNE  
ENUMERATIVE SURVEY VALUES

Type of Agency	State	RPA Value - Survey Value	JES Value - Survey Value	RPA Value - Survey Value / RPA Value	JES Value - Survey Value / JES Value
State Agencies	Arizona	\$7.47	\$7.97	.84	.85
	California	4.91	4.98	.47	.48
	Colorado	4.79	2.70	.47	.33
	Idaho	3.09	3.28	.39	.40
	Kansas	-8.90	-1.15	-6.79	-.13
	Montana	5.41	3.42	.47	.36
	Nebraska	.11	3.87	.01	.28
	Nevada	9.88	1.66	.68	.26
	New Mexico	4.41	2.83	.52	.41
	North Dakota	4.21	1.89	.38	.21
	Oklahoma	---	.18	---	.03
	Oregon	6.91	4.14	.67	.55
	South Dakota	7.33	6.91	.59	.58
Local Agencies	Utah	7.09	2.56	.60	.35
	Washington	8.10	4.59	.69	.56
	Wyoming	3.10	.93	.31	.12
	California	2.02	1.01	.19	.11
	Colorado	4.91	5.10	.48	.49
	Nevada	10.01	1.79	.69	.28
	New Mexico	5.56	3.98	.65	.57

TABLE 15

## FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF FEE DETERMINATION BY AGENCY 1/

Agencies Using Fee Determination Method:									
Agency State	State or Agency	Sealed Bids	Auction	Set by Board	Comparison with Private Rates	Negotiated	Formula	BLM/USFS	Number of Observations
State	Arizona	0	0	0	0	0	1.00	0	1
	California	.60	0	0	.80	.40	0	.20	5
	Colorado	.50	0	.50	0	0	0	0	2
	Idaho	1.00	0	.33	0	.33	0	.33	3
	Kansas	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Montana	1.00	0	0	0	0	.67	0	3
	Nebraska	0	0	.50	0	.50	0	0	2
	Nevada	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	.50	2
	New Mexico	1.00	0	0	0	0	.50	0	2
	North Dakota	0	.50	0	.50	.50	0	0	2
	Oklahoma	0	0	0	0	0	1.00	0	1
	Oregon	0	0	.33	.67	0	.33	.67	3
	South Dakota	0	1.00	0	0	0	1.00	0	1
	Utah	.33	.33	.33	0	.33	.67	0	3
	Washington	.67	.33	0	.67	.33	.67	0	3
	Wyoming	.33	0	.33	0	.33	.33	0	3
Local	California	.25	.06	.19	.19	.31	.38	0	16
	Colorado	.80	0	0	0	.20	0	0	5
	Idaho	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Nebraska	.60	0	0	.20	.20	0	0	5
	Nevada	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	0	1
	New Mexico	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Oregon	.50	0	0	0	.50	0	0	2
	South Dakota	.50	0	0	.50	0	0	0	2
Federal	Washington	0	.20	0	.80	.20	0	.20	5
	ARS	0	0	0	.33	0	.33	.33	3
	Air Force	.91	0	0	0	.18	0	0	11
	Army	.94	0	0	.22	0	0	0	18
	Corps of Engn.	.96	0	0	.24	0	0	0	45
	Navy	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	BIA	.60	0	0	.20	0	0	.03	30
	BOR	.40	0	0	.07	.07	0	.20	15
	F&W Service	.05	0	0	.88	.07	.15	0	41
	Nat'l Parks	0	0	0	.50	0	.08	.58	12
ALL AGENCIES		.54	.02	.04	.32	.09	.10	.07	259

1/ Many agencies use more than one method of fee determination so frequencies may sum to more than 1.

### Explanatory Analysis

This multiple regression analysis produces a regression equation which indicates the magnitude of influence of each particular independent variable on the grazing fee rate. Each parameter of the regression equations is tested for statistical significance. The influence of a particular independent variable on the dependent variable (fee rate) holding the simultaneous impact of all other included variables constant is easily derived. In addition, the total effect of all variables is also measured; this measure shows the percent change in the dependent variable (fee rate) "explained" by the entire set of independent variables. Incomplete data prohibited testing the full model as specified. Only 39 agencies responded to all questions necessary to produce a full set of variables as specified. Variables were dropped from the specifications to produce a more representative sample of the agencies surveyed and a regression was run. This regression is summarized in Table 16.

According to the analysis 94% of the variation in \$/AUM is "explained" by the model. Variables with statistically significant coefficients (95%) include: negotiated fee determination, the percentage of agency responsibility for fence maintenance, discount given, tenant control of access, and percent dollars retained by the agency. Coefficients are summarized in Table 17.

This analysis is difficult to understand and explain. The variables with significant coefficients cannot logically, by themselves, explain 94% of the variation in fee. Therefore, the analysis must be faulty. It is possible that variables included in this specification co-vary with un-included, unmeasured variables.

TABLE 16  
RESULTS OF REGRESSION

SUMMARY TABLE

VARIABLE	KEY	F	SIGNIFICANCE	MULTIPLE R	R SQUARE	R SQUARE CHANGE	SIMPLE R	OVERALL F	SIGNIFICANCE
MACRES	Mean Acres	.81150	.373	.00027	.00000	.00000	.00027	33.73988	.000
D5	Negotiated Fee Determination	17.03082	.000	.08460	.00716	.00716	.08460		
V134	Tenant controls "other" resources	1.89580	.176	.09159	.00839	.00123	-.03684		
V133	Tenant controls wildlife	1.57307	.216	.09490	.00901	.00062	.02271		
D2	Auction Determined Fee	.10949	.742	.14126	.01995	.01095	-.10663		
VI32	Tenant controls vehicular access	.03899	.844	.35256	.12430	.10435	.32385		
S	State Government	.60342	.441	.62365	.38894	.26464	.51800		
NULEAS	Number of leases	.04248	.838	.66462	.44172	.05279	-.24591		
VI175	Policy changes since 1970 (Yes-No)	.71395	.403	.70988	.50394	.06221	.21660		
D6	Formula Determined Fee	.09404	.761	.71768	.51506	.01112	-.08302		
AUMACRE	AUM/ACRE	2.43199	.126	.80660	.65060	.13554	.49275		
VI144	% Agency responsible for fence maintenance	5.05341	.030	.82606	.68237	.03177	.16695		
NULFRR	Lease duration X 1st right refusal	.19643	.660	.82694	.68383	.00145	-.18624		
VI168	Discount given (Yes-No)	19.78151	.000	.91989	.84620	.16237	.68556		
D4	Private rate determined fee	1.50536	.226	.92070	.84768	.00148	.43256		
L	Local government	.49847	.484	.93303	.87055	.02287	.07176		
VI131	Tenant controls access	37.72126	.000	.94692	.89665	.02610	.10197		
LEASEYR	Lease duration	.35542	.554	.95889	.91947	.02282	.67741		
PDOLRT	Percent \$retained	7.29473	.010	.96424	.92975	.01028	.50303		
D1	Sealed bid determined fee	3.50985	.068	.96841	.93782	.00807	.56105		
V130	Tenant controls hunting	2.79108	.102	.97033	.94153	.00371	.02346		

Dependent Variable: \$/AUM  
Number of Observations: 66

Yes = 1 for all dummy variables

TABLE 17  
REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS

COEFFICIENTS AND STANDARD ERRORS

VARIABLE	KEY	B	STD ERROR B	T	95.0% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL	
MALES	Mean Acres	-29004980E-04	.32197679E-04	-90081537	-91935523E-04	.52892563E-04
D5	Negotiated Fee Determination	4.5167450	1.0944800	4.1049811	3.5106165	1.7215395
V134	Tenant controls "other" resources	2.6108802	1.3962250	1.8758862	-1.2107182	6.4324795
V133	Tenant controls wildlife	-2.8032167	7.0192412	-1.2542218	-22.829055	5.3624273
D2	Auction Determined Fee	2.4966245	7.5456764	.33066362	-12.710574	17.004745
V132	Tenant controls vehicular access	-17107641	.86438441	-1.9744017	-1.9171505	1.8757507
S	State Government	-1.2780712	1.6453024	-1.7763003	-4.3934601	1.0373174
NLEAS	Number of leases	-14993441E-02	.72749784E-02	-200.094602	-1.4111104	1.3143812E-01
V175	Policy changes since 1970 (Yes-No)	.37864304	.63482310	.64492334	-2.6123323	1.70585314
D6	Formula Determined Fee	-53780129	1.7537407	-3.0465528	-4.677526	2.9524762
AUMACRE	AUM/ACRE	.78190303	.50138637	1.5593627	-2.2857525	1.7922199
V144	% Agency responsible for fence maintenance	.29790451E-01	.13252115E-01	2.2473795	.30524002E-01	.54481932E-01
NULFRR	Lease duration X 1st right refusal	-4.43171933E-02	.10192205E-01	-44.326079	-23.052255E-01	.18012246E-01
V168	Discount given (Yes-No)	3.4907579	.80161159	8.4474416	1.9780344	5.2749561
D4	Private rate determined fee	1.2056938	.98265360	1.2269325	-7.7475536	3.1551746
L	Local government	-1.5503494	2.1959180	-7.0602291	-5.5759504	2.9721334
V131	Tenant controls access	-6.0497039	.78501163	-8.1417633	-5.0245524	-4.0645484
LEASEYR	Lease duration	.16992489	.28484031	.59615901	-4.0427335	.74222312
POOLRT	Percent \$retained	3.5373241	1.3076553	2.7003755	.29780631	6.1765416
D1	Sealed bid determined fee	2.9960006	1.5991808	1.8754595	-2.2693452	4.2159377
V130	Tenant controls hunting	12.104472	7.2453553	1.6706525	-2.4973835	26.706327
CONSTANT		.21246219E-01	.14438679E-01	1.4714795	-7.853034E-02	.50375448E-01

Y = 1 for all dummy variables

Reproduced from best available copy.

Weighted Least Squares: An attempt to enhance the above analysis was made using weighted least squares. All variables in the model, as specified above, were weighted by dividing them by total AUM's. Both the dependent and independent variables were thus weighted. This analysis failed. The vast varieties in total AUM's in the denominators on both sides of the equation dominated all variations. No meaningful statistics were produced. An effort to alleviate this problem by weighting with the square root of total AUM's also failed.

Equity/Efficiency Regressions: An attempt was made to measure and explain the variations between fair market price and the fees surveyed. This model proposes to measure possible inequity or inefficiency and demonstrate the variables that best explain the relative difference between the actual fee and grazing fair market values (FMV). Free market values are alternatively measured by the Forage Value Index (June Enumerative Study) and the RPA Shadow Price (Gee). By specifying the relative difference  $(FMV - \text{actual fee})/FMV$  as the dependent variable we measure the percentage difference of an agency's fee from the free market value. To compare actual amounts  $(FMV - \text{actual fee})$  of this disparity would be misleading because lease rates vary drastically between states. For example, a \$2 difference may be a 50% difference for Nevada, but in Nebraska may only be a 20% difference. Thus, the percentage difference:  $(FMV - \text{actual fee})/FMV$  is used. Independent variables remain the same as for the other regressions reported herein.

JES -  $(\$/AUM \text{ surveyed})/JES$  was regressed on the set of independent variables. Results are summarized in Tables 18 and 19. The two significant variables (95% level of confidence) are: the award of a discount (discount

TABLE 18  
EQUITY/EFFICIENCY REGRESSION: JES

VARIABLE ENTERED REMOVED	Key	F	SUMMARY TABLE					OVERALL F	SIGNIFICANCE
			SIGNIFICANCE	MULTIPLE R	R SQUARE	R SQUARE CHANGE	SIMPLE R		
MACRES	Mean Acres	.00817	.928	.01000	.00010	.00010	.01000	4.26659	.000
V134	Tenant controls "other" resources	1.00513	.322	.04564	.00208	.00198	.04444		
L	Local Government	.22694	.636	.05543	.00307	.00099	-.03257		
D2	Auction Determined Fee	.00270	.959	.14435	.02084	.01776	.13122		
V175	Policy changes since 1970 (Yes-No)	.00890	.925	.15140	.02292	.00208	.03426		
V168	Discount Given (Yes-No)	21.56644	.000	.67641	.45753	.43460	-.66992		
D5	Negotiated Fee Determination	.49055	.487	.68105	.46383	.00631	.19674		
V132	Tenant controls vehicular access	1.96028	.168	.69561	.48388	.02004	.17913		
AUMACR	AUM/ACRE	.12541	.725	.69581	.48416	.00028	-.15138		
V131	Tenant controls access	7.33663	.010	.70453	.49637	.01221	.17084		
NULEAS	Number of leases	.08963	.766	.72130	.52027	.02391	.28048		
V144	% Agency responsible for fence maintenance	1.84578	.181	.72578	.52676	.00649	-.04377		
S	State Government	.09079	.765	.72626	.52746	.00070	.23347		
D4	Private rate determined fee	.00393	.950	.75287	.56681	.03935	.38823		
D6	Formula Determined Fee	1.01291	.320	.75312	.56720	.00039	.14674		
LEASEYR	Lease duration	.22998	.634	.76019	.57789	.01069	-.06659		
V133	Tenant controls wildlife	3.38347	.073	.76814	.59003	.01214	.12299		
NULFRR	Lease duration X 1st right refusal	.00969	.922	.77004	.59295	.00292	.25096		
PDOLRT	Percent \$ retained	.02113	.885	.77519	.60092	.00796	.08031		
V130	Tenant controls hunting	6.16376	.017	.80875	.65408	.05317	.06558		
D1	Sealed bid determined fee	2.21432	.144	.81894	.67065	.01657	-.46078		

Dependent Variable: JES-(\$/AUM)/JES

Number of Observations: 66

Yes = for all dummy variables.

TABLE 19  
COEFFICIENTS FOR EQUITY/EFFICIENCY REGRESSION: JES

COEFFICIENTS AND CONFIDENCE INTERVALS.

VARIABLE	Key	B	STD ERROR B	T	95.0 PCT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL
MACRES	Mean Acres	.22100037E-06	.24450233E-05	.90387838E-01	-.47066204E-05, .51486211E-05
VL34	Tenant controls "other" resources	-.12293451	.12262017	-1.0025635	-.37005923, .12419022
L	Local Government	-.11953359	.25092001	-.47638125	-.62522964, .38616247
D2	Auction Determined Fee	-.13995162E-01	.26948051	-.51933854E-01	-.55709745, .52910713
V175	Policy changes since 1970 (Yes-No)	-.87557334E-02	.92809526E-01	-.94340892E-01	-.19580104, .17828958
V168	Discount Given (Yes-No)	-.45033899	.96972887E-01	-4.6439681	-.64577501, -.25490293
D5	Negotiated Fee Determination	-.10331529	.14750987	-.70039579	-.40060190, .19397132
VI32	Tenant controls vehicular access	.21752467	.15536349	1.4001016	-.95589864E-01, .53063921
AUMACR	AUM/ACRE	-.25915398E-01	.73179554E-01	-3.5413441	-.17339910, .12156830
VI31	Tenant controls access	.58776503	.21699782	2.7086218	-.15043466, 1.0250954
NULEAS	Number of leases	.26340712E-04	.87980992E-04	.29939094	-.15097333E-03, .20365475E-03
VI44	% Agency responsible for fence maintenance	-.20248477E-02	.14904151E-02	-1.3585932	-.50286020E-02, .97886650E-03
S	State Government	.45095821E-01	.14966072	.30132035	-.25652555, .34671719
D4	Private rate determined fee	.11133046E-01	.17757117	.62696260E-01	-.34673814, .36900423
D6	Formula Determined Fee	-.17257271	.17146978	-1.0064323	-.51814734, .17300191
LEASEYR	Lease duration	.10122931E-01	.21108649E-01	.47956318	-.32418754E-01, .52664418E-01
V133	Tenant controls wildlife	.48103009	.26151158	1.8394218	-.46011874E-01, 1.0080721
NULFRR	Lease duration X 1st right refusal	.14540246E-04	.14773129E-03	.98423605E-01	-.28319260E-03, .31227310E-03
PDOLRT	Percent \$ retained	.27530754E-01	.18940521	.14535373	-.35419037, .40925188
V130	Tenant controls hunting	-.83213549	.33517453	-2.4826931	-.15076354, -.15663560
D1	Sealed bid determined fee	-.27532917	.18502558	-1.4820600	-.64822374, .97565387E-01
CONSTANT		.58338942	.21120773	2.7621594	.15772821, 1.0090506

Dependent Variable: JES-( \$/AUM)/JES

Yes = 1 for all dummy variables

given; yes-no) and tenant control of hunting. According to these results, these variables, together with the other specified variables, "explain" 67% of the variation in the dependent variable. This seems implausible; these variables cannot logically explain two-thirds of the variations in fee. A stepwise regression procedure was employed to try to gain a better understanding of interactions of independent variables. No understanding was obtained and the analysis fails.

RPA - ( $$/AUM$  surveyed)/RPA was regressed on the set of independent variables. Results are summarized in Tables 20 and 21. The only significant variable (95% level of confidence) is whether the agency observed is a state or other type of governmental agency. According to the model, the set of independent variables "explains" 35% of the variations in the dependent variable. A stepwise regression procedure was employed to try to clarify this analysis -- to no avail. This analysis fails.

In conclusion, the regression analyses offer little understanding of the variations in fee. Forces other than the forces included as variables in these analyses must impact grazing fees. Across such a widely varied sample of agencies, this conclusion is not surprising. Non-market forces, which are difficult to discern and measure, probably vary widely across the sample. These forces must affect fee more than the variables measured and included herein.

TABLE 20

EQUITY/EFFICIENCY REGRESSION: RPA

SUMMARY TABLE

VARIABLE ENTERED	REMOVED	Key	F TO ENTER OR REMOVE	SIGNIFICANCE	MULTIPLE R	R SQUARE	R SQUARE CHANGE	SIMPLE R	OVERALL F	SIGNIFICANCE
MACRES	Mean Acres		1.38419	.246	.06606	.00436	.00436	.06606	1.10756	.376
V134	Tenant controls "other" resources		.33737	.564	.09498	.00940	.00504	.07040		
L	Local Government		3.57361	.065	.10367	.01075	.00134	.03171		
D2	Auction Determined Fee		.17600	.677	.13571	.01842	.00767	.07574		
V175	Policy changes since 1970 (Yes-No)		.87269	.355	.24005	.05762	.03921	.19280		
V168	Discount Given (Yes-No)		1.65377	.200	.39272	.15423	.09661	-.35425		
D5	Negotiated Fee Determination		1.86248	.179	.40571	.16460	.01037	.12566		
V132	Tenant controls vehicular access		.59085	.325	.41517	.17237	.00777	.13013		
AUM/ACRE	AUM/ACRE		.33471	.566	.41523	.17242	.00005	-.03661		
V131	Tenant controls access		.01288	.910	.42315	.17906	.00644	.12160		
NULEAS	Number of leases		.12548	.725	.42860	.18370	.00465	.14257		
V144	% Agency responsible for fence maintenance		.10092	.752	.42940	.18439	.00049	.07926		
S	State Government		9.04432	.004	.49486	.24489	.00050	-.16883		
D4	Private rate determined fee		1.62094	.210	.49837	.24537	.00249	.15977		
D6	Formula Determined Fee		1.38156	.246	.50438	.25440	.00603	.10920		
LEASEYR	Lease duration		1.20859	.278	.52424	.25552	.01111	.04260		
V133	Tenant controls wildlife		.76053	.393	.53968	.29126	.00574	.08954		
NULLRR	Lease duration X 1st right refusal		.00204	.956	.54014	.29175	.00050	.12694		
PDOLRT	Percent \$ retained		3.62777	.063	.53187	.33857	.04581	.07690		
V130	Tenant controls hunting		.07217	.786	.53333	.34057	.00171	.07720		
D1	Sealed bid determined fee		.37226	.545	.53606	.34381	.00554	-.20513		

Dependent Variable: RPA-(\$/AUM)/RPA

Yes = for all dummy variables

TABLE 21  
COEFFICIENTS FOR EQUITY/EFFICIENCY REGRESSION: RPA

COEFFICIENTS AND CONFIDENCE INTERVALS.

VARIABLE	Key
MACRES	Mean Acres
V134	Tenant controls "other" resources
L	Local Government
D2	Auction Determined Fee
V175	Policy changes since 1970 (Yes-No)
V168	Discount Given (Yes-No)
D5	Negotiated Fee Determination
V132	Tenant controls vehicular access
AUM/ACRE	AUM/ACRE
V131	Tenant controls access
NULEAS	Number of leases
V144	% Agency responsible for fence maintenance
S	State Government
D4	Private rate determined fee
D6	Formula Determined Fee
LEASEYR	Lease duration
V133	Tenant controls wildlife
NULFRR	Lease duration X 1st right refusal
PDLRT	Percent \$ retained
V130	Tenant controls hunting
D1	Sealed bid determined fee
CONSTANT	

Reproduced from best available copy.

Dependent Variables: RPA-(\$/AUM)/RPA

Yes = 1 for all dummy variables

## SURVEY UPDATING PROCEDURES

The questionnaire form used for the census of grazing fees has been evaluated with regard to its effectiveness for updating the grazing census in future years. Factors considered in the evaluation include: (1) the usefulness of the data generated by each question included in the census survey form, (2) the extent to which each question on the form generated meaningful answers, (3) the degree of variability (or lack of it) among responses to a given question, and (4) the efficiency of the questions in eliciting desired responses. The focus of the evaluation was to minimize the time and effort required to collect sufficient information to update useful portions of the census. To this end, the form has been rewritten in places and shortened as much as was believed practicable. A combined telephone and mail survey is suggested as a way to minimize overall survey costs and maintain the survey response rate. Forms are presented in Appendix K.

### Nature of the Update Survey

A three-part survey technique is suggested in order to avoid costs and bad will engendered by repetitive survey. The initial telephone contact with each agency sampled can inform the agency as to the nature of the survey and attempt to collect information shown on page one of the attached form that is designated as "telephone form." Agency name, contact person name and address and phone number would be updated starting with information from the census of grazing to make the initial contacts. If possible, total grazing receipt and grazing fee charges would be ascertained by phone. Since this information is not always readily available, these questions will be repeated on the mail portion of the survey. Page two of the phone survey is essential; it assesses if there has been a change in policies or

procedures since the census. Specifically, question four elicits the information required in order to select the type of mail survey form(s) to send to the agency.

Once the telephone survey is completed for an agency, that agency will be mailed a standardized form designated as the "short form" in the attachments. In addition to the short form that is mailed to all agencies in the sample, other survey forms will be mailed as indicated by the telephone survey answers to question four of the "telephone form." For example, if the telephone survey question four shows that the agency has changed its grazing census, then the additional form designated as "fee determination" would be mailed along with the "short form" to that agency. In like manner, if the telephone interview indicated that the agency had grazing policy changes with regard to "lease policy," "expenditures and receipts," or "range improvements," the attached survey forms with these titles would also be included in the mail survey. Thus, only survey forms which include questions that are relevant for the agency are presented to it. Since many agencies seldom change their grazing policies, this technique should greatly reduce the mailing of inappropriate forms and reduces the burden on the agencies to that of reading and filling out relevant forms.

#### Timing of the Update Survey

As mentioned above, the rate of change of grazing policies is not very rapid. One exception to this occurs when federal administrations change. Our suggestion then, is to replicate the survey update every four years. Since the first year of a new administration is a period of flux and change, and policies are in the formation stage, we recommend conducting the survey update during the second year after national elections. Even if the national administration is unchanged, a four year period is sufficient that new policies may exist at both the federal and state and local government levels.

#### OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Local, state, and federal agencies other than USDA Forest Service (FS) and USDI Bureau of Land Management lease grazing in the 16 western states. However, for most, grazing and grazing management is not a primary mission of the agencies. Grazing is generally an incidental program which generates some income, although some agencies are required to lease or permit grazing. The method that agencies use to determine grazing fees is also variable, although competitive bid and leasing rates on private rates are the most common methods.

Bidding procedures and auctions most closely approximate a competitive free market and should determine a fair market price. Long periods between bids or auctions resulted in dated and possibly unsuitable fees. Short periods between bids or auctions resulted in high administrative costs in dollars and time. Fees determined by this method required little or no subjective judgments on the part of agency personnel and are less subject to political pressures.

Fees determined by boards are subject to political pressures and may require judgments on the part of agency personnel. Political pressures may result in inequities. The fees are relatively easy to administer and usually change from year to year. The fees tend to be equitable as the boards usually take into account the lessees ability to pay.

Fees based on private rates require extensive surveying of the private sector and matching of surveyed private lands to public grazing lands. Surveying is expensive and time consuming. In addition, time spent assembling survey data and matching private to public grazing lands dates the fees used.

In instances where this method is used, updating occurs every 3 to 5 years instead of annually.

Fees determined by formula are consistent throughout an area or agency. The formulas have been set by boards or legislatures, and have been negotiated through a political process. Consideration is given to the fair return to the agency as well as what is fair to the lessees. Thus, equity considerations have been made specifically or implicitly in the political process of determining the formula. Most formulas are adjusted annually based on beef prices of the previous year.

Negotiated fees are most useful when the leasing agency has special interests other than equity of fees and obtaining a fair grazing rate; e.g., wildlife agencies who want to maintain wildlife habitat. Negotiated fees are subject to political pressures, pressures of friendships between agency personnel and lessees, or other subjective judgments on the part of agency personnel. Negotiation is also commonly used when only one individual has access to a grazing area.

Efforts to stabilize and protect the western livestock industry affect the degree of equity accomplished by any fee determination method. Stability requires the ability of stockmen to plan expenditures, including grazing fees, whereas efficiency requires the ability of the fee determination system to quickly adapt to changing conditions. Lease duration<sup>1/</sup> and fee changes during the period of the lease do more to affect stability than the type of lease. Long leases with no changes of fees during the term of the lease increase stability, but may decrease efficiency and fairness. Short leases or leases with changes during the term of the lease decrease stability, but may potentially increase the degree of efficiency possible.

---

<sup>1/</sup>Differences in lease duration are displayed in Table G9, Appendix G.

Varying market conditions combined with time lags between phases of production and receipts reduce the correlation between costs of production and beef prices, and the ability of stockmen to pay for grazing. Costs of production and beef prices are only available for the past, and hence, agencies using these factors to determine fees have built a lag into the fee fluctuations. Agencies using formulas often use beef price information in those formulas. The cost of livestock production was rarely explicitly used in formulas. A few agencies, such as the Arizona State Land Department, that use a modified version of the PRIA formula, used both costs of production and beef prices to determine the grazing fee.

Determination of fair market value of public grazing is a difficult task. JES and RPA values were used as estimates of fair market value. Differences between the JES and RPA values and values determined in the survey were shown in Tables 13 and 14. In general, fees surveyed were less than values determined by JES and RPA.

Range improvement policies and expenditures varied by the type of agency administering grazing. Table 22 provides a comparison of fees between agencies which participate in range improvements by direct expenditures, agencies which provide incentive and means for ranchers to make improvements by providing rebates, and agencies which leave improvements to ranchers or have no improvements. As might be expected, fees for agencies which have no range improvements or rebates were lower than fees for the other two categories.

Table 22. Range Improvement and Rebate Policies and Grazing Fees

	N <sup>1/</sup>	\$/AUM
Agencies with range improvement expenditures	119	\$6.58
Agencies with rebate policies	74	7.37
Agencies without range improvement expenditures or rebates	38	6.00

<sup>1/</sup> Some agencies have both rebates and range improvement expenditures.

Improvement maintenance was most commonly the responsibility of the rancher. In wildlife agencies, the maintenance was usually shared. Maintenance responsibility was shown in Tables 3, 5, 7, 9, and 11.

Receipts for most agencies go to a general fund. Thus, use of receipts cannot be traced. Few agencies see a difference in their budget attributable to management of a grazing program. Giving agencies a percentage of grazing fees directly, without channeling monies through a general fund, might provide incentive to agencies for more equitable fee determinations and efficient grazing management.

In most cases, range management for domestic livestock production and stabilizing the western range livestock industry are not specific objectives of local, state, and federal agencies surveyed. Objectives include income generation and management of the grazing areas by the lessee. In most cases attempts have been made to balance income generation with what is fair and acceptable to the lessees. The survey did not indicate that

state agencies were more concerned with social welfare criteria than economic efficiency in setting grazing fees. In many instances, consideration was given to ease of administration, since grazing was a minor program of the agencies.

## GLOSSARY

Animal Unit Month: Tenure of one animal unit (one mature 1,000 lb cow or the equivalent) on range for a period of one month.

Free Market Value: In tables reporting regression analysis results, the free market value is the response to question II.4. (see Appendix C).

"Fair market value" is also used in the text. In the text, pp. 9-10, the phrase fair market value means the value or price which would be found in a perfectly competitive market.

SPSS: "Statistical Packages for Social Sciences" is a set of computer software useful in manipulating large data sets.

Carrying Capacity: The maximum stocking rate possible without inducing damage to vegetation or related resources.

AUM/Acre: Number of animal unit months divided by the number of acres of a Tease; the number of animal units that an acre of range will support for one month.

## APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
A. List of Agencies Leasing Grazing . . . . .	53
B. Grazing Lease Information. . . . .	68
C. Questionnaire. . . . .	155
D. Grazing Fee Formulas Used by State Land Agencies . . .	168
E. Grazing Fee Statistics Summarized by Type of Government.	173
F. Grazing Fee Statistics Summarized by State . . . . .	188
G. Grazing Fee Statistics Summarized by Fee Determination Method . . . . .	204
H. Grazing Fee Statistics Summarized by Tenant Rights . .	219
I. Grazing Fee Statistics Summarized by Non-Free Market Proxies. . . . .	229
J. Grazing Fee Statistics Summarized by Type of Agency. .	234
K. Forms for Updating Survey . . . . .	249

APPENDIX A

(List of Agencies)

Idaho: LIST OF AGENCIES LEASING GRAZING

Illinois:	Department of Parks and Recreation	2312000A 27AT2
Kansas:	Forestry, Fish and Game Commission	
Montana:	Department of Natural Resources Agricultural Experiment Station Department of Fish, Game and Parks Department of Natural Resources Department of Forestry	2312000A 27AT2
Nebraska:	Board of Education Game and Parks Commission University of Nebraska (administered by Educational Lands and Funds)	2312000A 27AT2
Nevada:	Nevada Division of State Parks Nevada Department of Natural Resources Division of Recreation	2312000A 27AT2
New Mexico:	New Mexico State Land Office Department of Fish and Game	2312000A 27AT2
North Dakota:	State Game and Fish Department State Game and Fish Department Parks and Recreation Department	2312000A 27AT2
Oklahoma:	Oklahoma Land Office	2312000A 27AT2
Oregon:	Division of State Lands	2312000A 27AT2
(South Dakota:	Division of State Lands Agricultural Experiment Station Department of Fish and Game Wildlife, Parks and Forestry Department	2312000A 27AT2
Utah:	Department of Natural Resources Division of State Lands Division of State Parks Division of State Parks Division of State Parks	2312000A 27AT2
Washington:	State Board of Land Commissioners Department of Natural Resources State Parks Board	2312000A 27AT2
Wyoming:	Department of Public Lands and Farm Loans Game and Fish Department State Recreation Commission	2312000A 27AT2

TABLE A1

List of Agencies Leasing Grazing

FEDERAL <sup>1/</sup>

U.S. Department of Agriculture  
Agricultural Research Service

U.S. Department of Defense  
Air Force  
Army  
Army Corps of Engineers  
Marine Corps  
Navy

U.S. Department of Interior  
Bureau of Indian Affairs  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Fish and Wildlife Service  
National Park Service

U.S. Department of Transportation (Peacetime)  
Coast Guard

STATE AGENCIES

Arizona: State Land Department  
Game and Fish Department (administered by State Land Dept.)  
Arizona Parks and Recreation (administered by State Land Department)

California: State Lands Commission  
Department of Water Resources  
University of California  
Department of Parks and Recreation  
Department of Fish and Game

Colorado: State Board of Land Commissioners  
Colorado Division of Wildlife  
State Forest Service (administered by State Land Board)

---

<sup>1/</sup>Excluding the U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management

\* Not interviewed because leasing less than 20 acres.

\*\* Not interviewed because contact could not be made.

\*\*\* Not interviewed because uncooperative.

TABLE A1 (Continued)

Idaho:	Department of State Lands Fish and Game Department Department of Parks and Recreation
Kansas:	Forestry, Fish and Game Commission
Montana:	Department of State Lands *** Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks Department of Natural Resources and Conservation Department of Forestry
Nebraska:	Board of Educational Lands and Funds Game and Parks Commission University of Nebraska (administered by Board of Educational Lands and Funds)
Nevada:	Nevada Division of State Parks Nevada Department of Wildlife
New Mexico:	New Mexico State Land Office Department of Fish and Game
North Dakota:	State Land Department State Game and Fish Department *** Parks and Recreation Department
Oklahoma:	Oklahoma Land Office
Oregon:	Division of State Lands Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife Oregon Department of Forestry
South Dakota:	Department of School and Public Lands *** Wildlife, Parks and Forestry Department
Utah:	Department of Natural Resources and Energy Division of State Lands and Forestry Division of Wildlife Resources Division of Parks and Recreation
Washington:	Department of Natural Resources Department of Game State Parks & Recreation Commission
Wyoming:	Department of Public Lands and Farm Loans Game and Fish Department State Recreation Commission

TABLE A1 (Continued)

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

California:

- \*Alameda Co. Water District
- \*Contra Costa Co. Water District
- East Bay Municipal Utility District
- East Bay Regional Parks Department
- Gavilan Water Conservation District
- Helix Water District
- Lake Hemet Municipal Water District
- Lindsay-Strathmore Irrigation District
- Los Angeles Water and Power Department
- Marin Co. Department of Parks and Recreation
- Mid-Peninsula Open Space District
- Merced Irrigation District
- Nevada Co. Water Agency
- \*\*Oakley-Bethel Island Waste Water Management Authority
- Orange County Water District
- Ramona Municipal Water District
- San Francisco Water and Power Department
- South Sutter Water District
- \*\*\*Terra Bella Irrigation District
- \*Tuloumne California Water District #2
- Turlock Irrigation District
- Vandalia Irrigation District
- Vista Irrigation District
- \*\*Westport County Water District
- Windsor County Water District
- Yuba County Water District

Colorado:

- Boulder Water Department
- City of Colorado Springs
- City of Fort Collins
- Denver Water Board
- Greeley Water Department
- Northern Colorado Water Conservation District
- Pueblo Water Department

Idaho:

- Boise Project Board of Control
- Lewiston Orchards Irrigation District

Nebraska:

- Central Platte N.R.D.
- City of Alliance
- City of North Platte
- City of Scottsbluff
- Lower Big Blue N.R.D.
- \*\*Sargent Irrigation District

SA-310AT

TABLE A1(Continued)

Nevada: Pershing County Water Conservation District  
Tuckee-Carson Irrigation District

New Mexico: Arch Hurley Conservation District  
Gallup Municipal Water System  
Roswell Municipal Water Supply

Oregon: City of Medford  
Westland Irrigation District

South Dakota: Brookings Water Superintendent  
\*\*Highmore Water Superintendent  
\*\*Hosmer Water Superintendent  
\*\*\*Howard Water Superintendent  
\*\*Kadoka Water Superintendent  
Miller Superintendent  
\*\*Platte Water Superintendent  
\*\*\*Selby Water Superintendent  
\*\*Winner Water Superintendent

Washington: City of Bellevue  
City of Walla Walla  
Ellensburg Water Department  
Longview Water Department  
Seattle Water Department

Wyoming: Deaver Irrigation District

1. Camp Roberts
2. Santa Rosa High. Freq. Radio Station
3. U.S. Army Depot Activity Pueblo
4. Sunbeam Army Ammunition Plant
5. Commissary Army Ammunition Plant
6. Mortar Ammunition Depot
7. Tooele Army Depot (and South Area)
8. Fort Lewis
9. Yakima Firing Range
10. Fort William Henry Harrison
11. Sheridan Army National Guard
12. Larimer National Guard Target Range
13. Lovell National Guard Target Range

Corps of Engineers

1. Prado F.C. Basin California
2. Black Butte Lake California
3. Farmington Dam California
4. New Hogan Lake California

TABLE A2

<u>Agricultural Research Service (USDA) Grazing Leases</u>	<u>State</u>
1. Central Plains Experimental Range	Colorado
2. Southern Great Plains Field Station	Oklahoma
3. Jornada Experimental Range	New Mexico
<u>Department of Transportation</u>	
1. Coast Guard, 12th District	California

TABLE A3  
Department of Defense Grazing Sites

<u>Installation</u>	<u>State</u>
<b>Air Force</b>	
1. Beale Air Force Base	California
2. March Air Force Base	California
3. Vandenberg Air Force Base	California
4. Travis Air Force Base	California
5. Davis Comm. Annex	California
6. Lincoln Comm. Annex	California
7. March Comm. Facil. Annex	California
8. Lowry Air Force Base (Training Annex)	Colorado
9. Cannon Air Force Base (Melrose RN)	New Mexico
10. Minot Air Force Base	North Dakota
11. Kegelman Air Force Aux. Field	Oklahoma
<b>Army</b>	
1. Navajo Ordnance Depot	Arizona
2. Hunter Liggett Military Reservation	California
3. Fort Ord	California
4. Camp Parks	California
5. Riverbank Army Ammo Plant	California
6. Camp Roberts	California
7. Santa Rosa High Freq. Radio Station	California
8. U.S. Army Depot Activity Pueblo	Colorado
9. Sunflower Army Ammo Plant	Kansas
10. Cornhusker Army Ammo Plant	Nebraska
11. McAlester Army Ammo Depot	Oklahoma
12. Tooele Army Depot (and South Area)	Utah
13. Fort Lewis	Washington
14. Yakima Firing Range	Washington
15. Fort William Henry Harrison	Montana
16. Sheridan Army National Guard	Wyoming
17. Lander National Guard Target Range	Wyoming
18. Lovell National Guard Target Range	Wyoming
<b>Corps of Engineers</b>	
1. Prado F.C. Basin	California
2. Black Butte Lake	California
3. Farmington Dam	California
4. New Hogan Lake	California

TABLE A3  
(Continued)

<u>Installation</u>	<u>State</u>
<u>Corps of Engineers (Continued)</u>	
5. Success Lake	California
6. Terminus Dam (Lake Kaweah)	California
7. Lucky Peak Dam	Idaho
8. Hillsdale Lake	Kansas
9. Kanopolis Lake	Kansas
10. Melvern Lake	Kansas
11. Milford Lake	Kansas
12. Perry Lake	Kansas
13. Pomona Lake	Kansas
14. Tuttle Creek Lake	Kansas
15. Council Grove Lake	Kansas
16. Elk City Lake	Kansas
17. Fall River Lake	Kansas
18. Marion Lake	Kansas
19. Toronto Lake	Kansas
20. Mathews Canyon Reservoir (BLM)	Nevada
21. Santa Rosa Lake	New Mexico
22. Bowman-Haley Dam	North Dakota
23. Garrison Dam/Lake Sakakawea	North Dakota
24. Candy Lake	Oklahoma
25. Canton Lake	Oklahoma
26. Coran Lake	Oklahoma
27. Eufaula Lake	Oklahoma
28. Fort Gibson Lake	Oklahoma
29. Hugo Lake	Oklahoma
30. Hulah Lake	Oklahoma
31. Kaw Lake	Oklahoma
32. Keystone Lake	Oklahoma
33. Lake Texoma-Red River	Oklahoma
34. Oologah Lake	Oklahoma
35. Robert S. Kerr Lock/Dam	Oklahoma
36. Skiatook Lake	Oklahoma
37. Tenkiller Ferry Lake	Oklahoma
38. W.D. Mayo Lake/Dam	Oklahoma
39. Webbers Falls Lock/Dam	Oklahoma
40. Wister Lake	Oklahoma
41. Green Peter Foster Lakes	Oregon
42. Big Bend Dam/Lake Sharpe	South Dakota
43. Fort Randall Dam/Lake Francis Case	South Dakota
44. Gavins Point Dam/Lewis-Clark Lake	South Dakota
45. Oahe Dam and Lake	South Dakota
46. Little Goose Lock and Dam	Washington

TABLE A3  
(Continued)

<u>Installation</u>	<u>State</u>
<u>Navy</u>	
1. China Lake Naval Weapons Center (BLM)	California
2. Camp Pendleton (Marine Corps)	California
3. Concord Weapons Station	California
4. Fallbrook Weapons Station	California
5. Naval Shipyard Mare Island	California
6. Naval Oil Shale Reserve (BLM)	Colorado
7. Boardman Bombing Range	Oregon
8. Manchester Fuel Depot	Washington
9. Whidbey Island Naval Air Station	Washington
10. Minidoka Dam	
11. Colorado River	
12. Colorado River	
13. Colorado River	
14. Colorado River	
15. Colorado River	
16. Colorado River	
17. Colorado River	
18. Colorado River	
19. Colorado River	
20. Colorado River	
21. Lower Colorado	Arizona
22. Lower Colorado	Arizona
23. Millerton Lake	California
24. San Joaquin	California
25. Sacramento River	California
26. Sacramento River	California
27. Fort Ord	California
28. Tule Lake	California
29. Yerington	Nebraska
30. Dixie National Forest	Utah
31. San Joaquin	California
32. San Joaquin	California
33. San Joaquin	California
34. San Joaquin	California
35. San Joaquin	California
36. San Joaquin	California
37. San Joaquin	California
38. Yerington	Nebraska
39. Elkhorn Ranch	Oregon

TABLE A4  
Bureau of Indian Affairs Grazing Sites

	<u>State</u>
1. Central California Agency	California
2. Horton Agency	Kansas
3. Fort Hall Indian Reservation	Idaho
4. Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation	Montana
5. Fort Peck Indian Reservation	Montana
6. Fort Belknap Indian Reservation	Montana
7. Rocky Boys Indian Reservation	Montana
8. Flathead Indian Reservation	Montana
9. Crow Indian Reservation	Montana
10. Blackfeet Indian Reservation (Browning)	Montana
11. Fort McDermitt Indian Reservation	Nevada/Oregon
12. Goshute Indian Reservation	Nevada/Utah
13. Pine Nut Indian Reservation	Nevada
14. Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation	Nevada
15. Summit Lake Indian Reservation	Nevada
16. Navajo Indian Reservation	New Mexico
17. Fort Berthold Indian Reservation	North Dakota
18. Fort Totten Indian Reservation	North Dakota
19. Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation	North Dakota
20. Anadarko Agency	Oklahoma
21. Ardmore Agency	Oklahoma
22. Concho Agency	Oklahoma
23. Miami Agency	Oklahoma
24. Okmulgee Agency	Oklahoma
25. Osage Agency	Oklahoma
26. Pawnee Agency	Oklahoma
27. Shawnee Agency	Oklahoma
28. Tahlequah Agency	Oklahoma
29. Talahena Agency	Oklahoma
30. Wewoka Agency	Oklahoma
31. Umatilla Indian Reservation	Oregon
32. Standing Rock Indian Reservation	South Dakota
33. Cheyenne River Indian Reservation	South Dakota
34. Rosebud Indian Reservation	South Dakota
35. Pine Ridge Indian Reservation	South Dakota
36. Crow Creek Indian Reservation	South Dakota
37. Lower Brule Indian Reservation	South Dakota
38. Yakima Indian Reservation	South Dakota
39. Colville Indian Reservation	Washington
40. Wind River Indian Reservation	Wyoming

TABLE A5

Bureau of Reclamation Grazing Sites

<u>Project or Unit</u>	<u>State</u>
1. Gila	Arizona
2. Salt River	Arizona
3. Yuma	Arizona/California
4. Willows	California
5. Folsom	California
6. Auburn	California
7. Napa	California
8. Tracy	California
9. Fresno	California
10. Pine River	Colorado
11. Narrows Unit - PSMBP	Colorado
12. Boise	Idaho
13. Mann Creek	Idaho
14. Minidoka	Idaho
15. Canyon Ferry	Montana
16. Crow Creek	Montana
17. East Bench	Montana
18. Helena Valley	Montana
19. Huntley	Montana
20. Intake	Montana
21. Lower Mariae	Montana
22. Lower Yellowstone	Montana
23. Milk River	Montana
24. Sun River	Montana
25. Hammond	New Mexico
26. Carlsbad	New Mexico
27. Fort Summer	New Mexico
28. Tucumcari	New Mexico
29. Buford - Trenton	North Dakota
30. Dickinson	North Dakota
31. Garrison Diversion	North Dakota
32. Heart Butte	North Dakota
33. Mountain Park	Oklahoma
34. Baker	Oregon
35. Owyhoe	Oregon
36. Rogue River	Oregon
37. Umatilla	Oregon
38. Vale	Oregon
39. Klamath	Oregon
40. Klamath Forest National Wildlife Refuge	Oregon
41. Malheur National Wildlife Refuge	Oregon
42. Hart Mountain National Wildlife Refuge	Oregon
43. Umatilla National Wildlife Refuge	Oregon
44. William L. Finley National Wildlife Refuge	Oregon
45. Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuge	Oregon
46. Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge	Oregon/California

TABLE A5

(Continued)

<u>Project or Unit</u>	<u>State</u>
40. Angostura	South Dakota
41. Belle Fourche	South Dakota
42. Oahe	South Dakota
43. Shadehill	South Dakota
44. Central Utah	South Dakota
45. Flaming Gorge Unit, Colo. River Storage Project	Utah
46. Weber River	Utah/Wyoming
47. Provo River	Utah
48. Columbia Basin	Utah
49. Okanogan	Washington
50. Yakima	Washington
51. Eden	Washington
52. Seedskadee	Wyoming
53. Boysen	Wyoming
54. Hanover Bluff	Wyoming
55. Keyhole	Wyoming
56. Riverton	Wyoming
57. Shoshone	Wyoming

TABLE A6  
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service Grazing Sites

	<u>State</u>
1. Kofa Game Range	Arizona
2. Kern National Wildlife Refuge	California
3. Hopper Mountain National Wildlife Refuge	California
4. Pixley National Wildlife Refuge	California
5. Delevan National Wildlife Refuge	California
6. Kesterson National Wildlife Refuge	California
7. Modoc National Wildlife Refuge	California
8. Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuge	California
9. Alamosa & Monte Vista National Wildlife Refuges	Colorado
10. Browns Park National Wildlife Refuge	Colorado
11. Arapaho National Wildlife Refuge	Colorado
12. Bear Lake National Wildlife Refuge	Idaho
13. Minidoka National Wildlife Refuge	Idaho
14. Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge	Idaho
15. Camas Lake National Wildlife Refuge	Idaho
16. Kootenai National Wildlife Refuge	Idaho
17. Quivira National Wildlife Refuge	Idaho
18. Charles M. Russell National Wildlife Refuge	Montana
19. Red Rock Lakes National Wildlife Refuge	Montana
20. Medicine Lake National Wildlife Refuge	Montana
21. Benton Lake National Wildlife Refuge	Montana
22. Bowdoin Lake (Black Coulee & Credman Coulee)	Montana
23. Crescent Lake National Wildlife Refuge	Montana
24. Fort Niobrara National Wildlife Refuge	Nebraska
25. Valentine National Wildlfie Refuge	Nebraska
26. Rainwater Basin Wetland Mgt. District	Nebraska
27. Charles Sheldon Antelope Range	Nevada
28. Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge	Nevada
29. Pahranagat National Wildlife Refuge	Nevada
30. Ruby Lake National Wildlife Refuge	Nevada
31. Las Vegas National Wildlife Refuge	New Mexico
32. Arrowwood National Wildlife Refuge	North Dakota
33. Upper Souris National Wildlife Refuge	North Dakota
34. J. Clark Saylor National Wildlife Refuge	North Dakota
35. Lostwood National Wildlife Refuge	North Dakota
36. Audubon National Wildlife Refuge	North Dakota
37. Des Lacs National Wildlife Refuge	North Dakota
38. Kulm Waterfowl Management District	North Dakota
39. Salt Plains National Wildlife Refuge	Oklahoma
40. Klamath Forest National Wildlife Refuge	Oregon
41. Malheur National Wildlife Refuge	Oregon
42. Hart Mountain National Wildlife Refuge	Oregon
43. Umatilla National Wildlife Refuge	Oregon
44. William L. Finley National Wildlife Refuge	Oregon
45. Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuge	Oregon
46. Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge	Oregon/California

TABLE A6

(Continued)

	<u>State</u>
47. Lacreek National Wildlife Refuge	South Dakota
48. Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge	South Dakota
49. Waubay National Wildlife Refuge	South Dakota
50. Lake Nades National Wildlife Refuge	South Dakota
51. Madison Waterfowl Management District	South Dakota
52. Columbian White-tailed Deer	Washington
53. Willapa National Wildlife Refuge	Washington
54. Ridgefield National Wildlife Refuge	Washington
55. Columbia National Wildlife Refuge	Washington
56. Turnbull National Wildlife Refuge	Washington

TABLE A7  
National Park Service Grazing Sites

	<u>State</u>
1. Grand Canyon National Park	Arizona
2. Glen Canyon National Recreation Area	Arizona/Utah
3. Pt. Reyes National Seashore	California
4. Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument	Colorado
5. Curecanti National Recreation Area	Colorado
6. Dinosaur National Monument	Colorado/Utah
7. Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument	Colorado
8. Nez Perce (NHP)	Idaho
9. Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area	Montana
10. Grant-Kohrs Ranch National Historic Site	Montana
11. Lake Mead National Recreation Area	Nevada/Arizona
12. John Day Fossil Beds	Oregon
13. Coulee Dam National Recreation Area	Washington
14. Whitman Mission National Historic Site	Washington
15. Fossil Butte National Monument	Wyoming
16. Grand Teton National Park	Wyoming
17. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Memorial Parkway	Wyoming
18. Capitol Reef National Monument	Utah

APPENDIX B  
GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
~~SECTION I~~  
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
STATE AGENCIES**

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUM's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
State Land Department	AZ	8,775,023	1,269,840	1,565	1,450	Formula	1	Yes	1.43/AUM	10	Yes	No	200,000	1,482,822	No Record	Yes
State Land Commission	CA	92,877	3,300	19	19	Bids, Private Rates, BLM-USFS	5	No	1.70/AUM	10	No	No	3,500	10,300	0	No
Department of Water Resources	CA	8,926	No Record	21	19	Negotiated, Bids, Private Rates	1	No	No Record 10.76/AC 15.00/Acre	5	No	Yes	10,000	42,710	0	Yes
University of California	CA	2,000	463	3	3	Private Rates	3	Yes	8.00/AUM	3	No	No	No Record	3,704	No Record	No
Department of Parks and Recreation	CA	26,822	No Record	10	No Record	Private Rates	Variab- le	Yes	3.00/AUM	1 2 5 10	Yes	Yes	No Record	156,319	No Record	Yes
Department of Fish and Game	CA	Did not respond				Bids	1-3	No		1-3	Yes	No	No Record	Responding	0	No
Colorado State Land Commission	CO	2,724,698	No Record	3,000	2,750	Set by Board	3	Yes	3.00/AUM	10	No	Yes	No Record	No Record	60,000	Yes
Colorado Division of Wildlife	CO	50,000	2,500	12	12	Bids	1	Yes	8.00/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	20,000	20,000	Yes
Department of State Lands	ID	2,090,000	274,000	1,600	1,200	Bids, Board Set	1	Yes	4.25/AUM	10	Yes	No	No Record	893,983	89,400	Yes

### GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION

#### STATE AGENCIES

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures \$	Rebate Yes No	Amount	Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By: Agency Rancher Both	Length of Use Determined By: Agency Rancher Both
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %				A	B	C	D		
AZ	State Land Department	X			100		No Record		X		X			X	X
CA	State Lands Commission	X			100		None		X		X			X	X
CA	Department of Water Resources	X			100		None	X		No Record		X		X	X
CA	University of California	X	3,704		100		No Record	X		No Record		X		X	X
CA	Department of Parks and Recreation	-No Record-			100		No Record	X		No Record		X		X	X
CA	Department of Fish and Game	X	No Record		100		None		X		X		X		X
CO	Colorado State Land Commission	X			100		40,000		X		X			X	X
CO	Colorado Division of Wildlife	X	20,000	Shared but no record			20,000		X		X		X		X
ID	Department of State Lands	X	89,398		100		89,400	X		No Record		X		X	X

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
STATE AGENCIES**

<u>Agency/Region/ Project</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Acres Grazed</u>	<u>No. AUM's</u>	<u>Leases</u>	<u>Lessees</u>	<u>Fee Determi- nation</u>	<u>Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)</u>	<u>Other Factors Consi- dered</u>	<u>Typical Fee and Basis \$</u>	<u>Lease Term</u>	<u>Term Varia- ble</u>	<u>Lessee Other Rights</u>	<u>Oper- ation Costs \$</u>	<u>Total Grazing Income \$</u>	<u>Range Improve- ment Expen- diture</u>	<u>Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)</u>
Idaho Fish & Game Department	ID	4,800	3,470	9	9	Bids, Negotiated, BLM-USFS	1	Yes	8.50/AUM 2.50/AUM BLM-USFS rate	1	No	No	17,500	14,640	None	No
Idaho Department of Parks & Recreation	ID	9,460	No Record	9	9	Bids, Board Set	2	No	5.00/AUM	3 or 10	Yes	No	No Record	49,856	No Record	Yes
Fish & Game Commission	KS	8,092	3,608	6	6	Bids	1	Yes	10.21/AUM	3	Yes	No	No Record	105,808	21,506	No
Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks	MT	--No Information--				Bids, Negotiated	1	Yes	11.00/AUM	--No Information--			No Record	No Record	0	No
Department of State Lands	MT	4,090,430	No Record	6,000	No Record	Bids with Formula	1	Yes	3.47/AUM	10	No	Yes	122,000	4,587,131	41,141	Yes
Division of Forestry	MT	181,676	14,930	325	No Record	Bids with Formula	1	Yes	3.47/AUM	10	No	Yes	No Record	58,626	0	Yes
Board of Educational Lands and Funds	NE	1,235,346	No Record	884	No Record	Board Set	1	Yes	14.00/AUM	5 to 12	Yes	Yes	1,400,000	No Record	No Record	Yes
Game and Parks Commission	NE	1,003	495	3	3	Negotiated	1	Yes	6.45/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	2,731	None	No
Nevada Division of State Parks	NV	941	1,686	3	3	Bids	4 to 5	Yes	5.30/AUM	4 to 5	Yes	No	No Record	15,255	1,584	No

<sup>1</sup> Indicates payments for future years and value of services.

GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
STATE AGENCIES

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures \$	Yes	Rebate No	Amount	Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:		
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %					A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both
ID	Idaho Fish and Game	X		14,640	75	25	None		X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X	
ID	Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation	X		49,856		100	No Record		X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X	
KS	Fish and Game Commission	X			Shared, No Record			0	X		As spe- cified in leases		X	X	X			X		
MT	Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks	X			25	75		0		X		X	X	X	X			X		
MT	Department of State Lands	X		9,641		100	41,141		X		X		X	X	X			X		
MT	Division of Forestry	X				100		0		X		X		X	X			X		
NE	Board of Educational Lands and Funds	X		1,400,000		100		0	X		No Record		X	X	X			X		
NE	Game and Parks Commission	X		2,731		100	None		X		X		X		X		X	X		
NV	Nevada Division of State Parks	X			100		792	X		No Record		X		X			X		X	

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUM's	GRAZING LEASES		Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
				Leases	Lessees											
Nevada Depart- ment of Wildlife	NV	91,045	4,816	3	10	Bid, BLM-USFS	1	Yes	4.00/AUM	1	No	No	5,000	11,600	0	Yes
New Mexico State Land Office	NM	10,962,097	No Record	5,489	5,489	Bids, Formula	5	No	1.60/AUM	5	No	Yes	No Record	3,013,660	No Record	Yes
Department of Game & Fish	NM	60,000	No Record	24	No Record	Bids	3	No	5.00/AUM	5	Yes	No	No Record	No Record	No Record	No
State Land Department	ND	705,000	No Record	2,400	1,600	Auction (Bids)	1	No	No Record	5	Yes	Yes	No Record	1,000,000	None	Yes
State Game & Fish Depart- ment	ND	13,450	1,470	60	60	Private rates, Negotiated	1	No	7.00/AUM 5.00/Acre	1	Yes	No	No Record	22,817	None	No
Oklahoma Land Office	OK	625,000	650,000	300	700	Formula	1	No	5.70/AUM	5	No	Yes	No Record	3,700,705	175,000 plus	Yes
Division of State Lands	OR	607,916	56,095	258	256	Board Set, BLM-USFS	10	Yes	2.50/AUM 2.30/AUM	10	Yes	No	141,310	193,284	No Record	Yes
Department of Fish & Wild- life	OR	79,921	21,075	50	50	Private rates, Formula	1	Yes	5.84/AUM	1 or 5	Yes	No	No Record	127,907	25,000	Yes
State Depart- ment of Forestry	OR	4,202	93	3	3	Private rates, BLM-USFS	1	No	2.25/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	209.25	No Record	No

Grazing Lease Information  
State Agencies

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:			
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	\$	Yes	No	Rebate Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both
NV	Nevada Department of Wildlife	X		11,600		100	0	X		No Record	X	X			X			X		
NM	New Mexico State Land Office	X		602,732 (20%)		100	0		X					X		X			X	
NM	Department of Game and Fish	X		No Record		100	No Record	X		No Record	X		X	X				X		
ND	State Land Department		X			100	None		X				X	X		X			X	
OK	Oklahoma Land Office	X		20-30% Up to 45%		100	175,000		X				X			X			X	
OR	Division of State Lands	X				100	No Record	X		No Record	X			X			X			X
OR	Department of Fish and Wildlife	X		25	75	25,000		X			X		X	X			X			X
OR	State Department of Forestry	X		33.75%		100	No Record		X			X	X	X				X		

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
STATE AGENCIES**

<u>Agency/Region/ Project</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Acres Grazed</u>	<u>No. AUM's</u>	<u>Leases</u>	<u>Lessees</u>	<u>Fee Determi- nation</u>	<u>Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)</u>	<u>Other Factors Consi- dered</u>	<u>Typical Fee and Basis \$</u>	<u>Lease Term</u>	<u>Term Varia- ble</u>	<u>Lessee Other Rights</u>	<u>Opera- tion Costs \$</u>	<u>Total Grazing Income \$</u>	<u>Range Improve- ment Expen- diture</u>	<u>Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)</u>
Department of Schools and Public Lands	SD	845,305	331,779	3,082	1,596	Bids with Formula	1	No	2.23/Ac	5	Yes	Yes	212,956	1,384,872	4,500	Yes
Division of State Lands & Forestry	UT	2,814,726	153,000	2,500	2,342	Board Set	1	No	2.36/AUM	10	Yes	No	No Record	412,610	85,000 + Cooperation	Yes
Division of Wildlife Resources	UT	140,174	No Record	37	41	Bids, Formula	1	Yes	5.44/AUM	1 3 10	Yes	No	No Record	37,805	71,850	No
Division of Parks & Recreation	UT	110,553	No Record	25	25	Bids, Negotiated	5	Yes	6.25/AUM	5	No	No	No Record	12,752	0	Yes
Department of Natural Resources	WA	885,638	No Record	1,815	No Record	Bids, Negotiations Formula	1	Yes	3.37/AUM	10	No	Yes	84,323	337,294	30,000	Yes
Department of Game	WA	163,715	13,049	75	75	Formula (DNR), Private rates, Auction	1 or 5	No	4.25/AUM	1 3	Yes	No	No Record	48,968		No
State Parks & Recreation Commission	WA	7,178	751	24	14	Bids, Private rates	5	No	3.15/AUM	10	No	Yes	No Record	2,010	None	Yes
Department of Public Lands & Farm Loans	WY	3,614,887	931,779	3,899	2,533	Formula	2	Yes	1.65/AUM	10	Yes	Yes	No Record	1,537,435	701,562	No

GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
STATE AGENCIES

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Rebate				Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:			
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both	
SD	Department of Schools and Public Lands	X			100		0		X					X				X				X		
UT	Division of State Lands and Forestry	X	412,610		100		85,000		X					X				X				X		
UT	Division of Wildlife Resources	X		95	5		71,850		X					X				X				X		
UT	Division of Parks and Recreation	X		100			None		X					X								X		
WA	Department of Natural Resources	X	84,323		100		30,000		X					X	X							X		
WA	Department of Game	X	12,242		100		None		X					X	X			X				X		
WA	State Parks and Recreation Commission	X			100		None		X					X								X		
WY	Department of Public Lands & Farm Loans	X		100			7,782	X		No Record	X							X				X		

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

D = DRAFT  
 C = CONTRACT LEASE CONSIDERED OR IN SOME FORM  
 R = RELEASED LEASES THAT HAVE BEEN MADE  
 S = SUBLEASES MADE AND ARE ACTIVE

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
STATISTICS**

<u>Agency/Region/ Project</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Acres Grazed</u>	<u>No. AUM's</u>	<u>Leases</u>	<u>Lessees</u>	<u>Fee Determi- nation</u>	<u>Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)</u>	<u>Other Factors Consi- dered</u>	<u>Typical Fee and Basis \$</u>	<u>Lease Term</u>	<u>Term Varia- ble</u>	<u>Lessee Other Rights</u>	<u>Opera- tion Costs \$</u>	<u>Total Grazing Income \$</u>	<u>Range Improve- ment Expen- diture</u>	<u>Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)</u>
Game & Fish Department	WY	54,347	7,389	17	17	Bids, Negotia- tions	3 to 5	No	11.00/AUM 3.00/AUM <sup>1</sup>	1 to 5	Yes	No	No Record	70,868	No Record	No
State Recrea- tion Com- mission	WY	30,839	7,499	51	46	Board Set	3	No	1.65/AUM	2 or 5	Yes	No	No Record	12,373	No Record	Yes

<sup>1</sup>Trailing

GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
 STATE AGENCIES

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Yes	No	Rebate Amount	Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:		
		Retained	Yes	No	Agency %	Rancher %	\$	A	B				C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher
WY	Game and Fish Department	X	70,868	65	35	No Record		X		X	X	X				X						
WY	State Recreation Commission	X		100		None		X		X						X	X					

-78

\*For Tenure Rights:  
 A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

D = DRAFT  
 E = LEASING PERMIT ISSUED OR IN PROCESS  
 S = LEASING CONDUCTED AND LEASES IN PLACE  
 U = UNLEASED RIGHTS  
 Y = GRAZING PERMIT FOR USE

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
**LOCAL AGREEMENTS**

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUM's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
East Bay Municipal Utility District	CA	27,561	27,894	40	40	Formula	1	No	14.98/AUM	5	No	Yes	No Record	402,510	40,251	Yes
East Bay Regional Parks District	CA	30,151	16,325	20	25	Board Set, Formula	1	No	11.90/AUM	5	No	No	No Record	187,500	28,500	Yes
Galivan Water Conservation District	CA	200	No Record	1	1	Negotiated	N/A	Yes	1.00/Ac	1	No	Yes	No Record	200	0	No
Helix Water District	CA	1,100	No Record	10	8	Sealed bid, Private rates	1-2	Yes	7.56/Ac 10.00/Ac	5	Yes	Yes	No Record	10,000	0	Yes
Lake Hemet Municipal Water District	CA	800	450 <sup>1</sup>	1	1	Sealed Bid	5	No	8.33/AUM	5	No	No	No Record	9,920	300	Yes
Lindsay-Strathmore Irrigation District	CA	900	No Record	1	1	Sealed Bid, Auction	5	No	25.00/Acre	5	No	No	No Record	22,900	0	Yes
Los Angeles Water & Power Department	CA	240,000	45,000	55	35-40	Formula, Private rates	1	Yes	3.90/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	650,000	65,000	Yes
Marin County Dept. of Parks & Recreation	CA	1,500	No Record	3	3	Private rates	1	Yes	11.00/Ac	1	No	No	No Record	No Record	No Record	No

<sup>1</sup> Estimated

GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
 LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures		Rebate			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:		
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both	
CA	East Bay Municipal Utility District	X		402,510		100	40,251	X		No Record				X			X			X	
CA	East Bay Regional Parks District	X		184,200		100	24,000		X				X			X			X		X
CA	Galivan Water Conservation District	X		200		100	0		X		X					X			X		X
CA	Helix Water District	X		10,000	Shared, but No Record		0	X		100%		X				X			X		CS
CA	Lake Hemet Municipal Water District	X		9,920	100		300		X				X			X			X		X
CA	Lindsay-Strathmore Irrigation District	X		22,900		100	0		X				X			X			X		X
CA	Los Angeles Water & Power Department	X		650,000	10	90	65,000		X				X			X			X		X
CA	Marin County Dept. of Parks and Recreation	X		No Record	10	90	No Record		X				X			X			X		X

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
LOCAL GOVERNMENTS**

<u>Agency/Region/ Project</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Acres Grazed</u>	<u>No. AUM's</u>	<u>Leases</u>	<u>Lessees</u>	<u>Fee Determi- nation</u>	<u>Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)</u>	<u>Other Factors Consi- dered</u>	<u>Typical Fee and Basis \$</u>	<u>Lease Term</u>	<u>Term Varia- ble</u>	<u>Lessee Other Rights</u>	<u>Opera- tion Costs \$</u>	<u>Total Grazing Income \$</u>	<u>Range Improve- ment Expen- diture</u>	<u>Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)</u>
Mid-Peninsula Open Space District	CA	500	600 <sup>1</sup>	3	3		5	No				No	No Record	0	No	
Merced Irrigation District	CA	1,300	No Record	5	5	Negotiated	3	Yes	5.00/Ac	3	No	Yes	No Record	4,925	None	No
Nevada County Irrigation District	CA	1,025	300	2	2	Formula	1	Yes	2.45/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	740	None	Yes
Orange County Water District	CA	600	3,600	1	1	Bids	1	No	No Record	5	Yes	Yes	No Record	9,000	None	Yes
Ramona Municipal Water District	CA	300	No Record	1	1	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	5	No	No	No Record	5,000	None	Yes
San Francisco Water & Power	CA	40,243	No Record	28	28	Bids & Formula	3	No	17.00/Acre	3-5	Yes	Yes	100,000	680,000	No Record	Yes
South Sutter Water District	CA	2,200	No Record	1	1	Unknown <sup>2</sup>	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	50	Unknown	No	No Record	5,000	None	No
Turlock Irrigation District	CA	500	No Record	7-8	7-8	Negotiated	1	Yes	4.00/Acre	1	No	1	No Record	2,000	None	No
Vandalia Irrigation District	CA	152	No Record	1	1	Board Set	10	Yes	18.09/Acre	Un- known	Unknown	Yes	No Record	2,750	None	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> Estimated

<sup>2</sup> Set by concessionaire who has a 50 year lease.

GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Yes	Rebate	Tenure Rights*	Season of Use Determined By:		Length of Use Determined By:				
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	\$	Yes	No				A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both
CA	Mid-Peninsula Open Space District	X			10	90	0		X			X					X		X
CA	Merced Irrigation District	X		4,925		100	0	X		No Record		X					X		X
CA	Nevada County Irrigation District	X		740	None	None	None		X		X						X		X
CA	Orange County Water District	X		9,000		100	None		X		X	X					X		X
CA	Ramona Municipal Water District	X		100%	100		None		X		X						X		X
CA	San Francisco Water and Power	X		No Record		100	No Record	X		No Record	X	X					X		X
CA	South Sutter Water District	X		5,000		100	None		X		X						X		X
CA	Turlock Irrigation District	X		2,000		100	None		X		X						X		X
CA	Vandalia Irrigation District	X		2,750		100	None	--No Record--			X						X		X

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
**LOCAL**

<u>Agency/Region/ Project</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Acres Grazed</u>	<u>No. AUH's</u>	<u>Leases</u>	<u>Lessees</u>	<u>Fee Determi- nation</u>	<u>Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)</u>	<u>Other Factors Consi- dered</u>	<u>Typical Fee and Basis \$</u>	<u>Lease Term</u>	<u>Term Varia- ble</u>	<u>Lessee Other Rights</u>	<u>Opera- tion Costs \$</u>	<u>Total Grazing Income \$</u>	<u>Range Improve- ment Expen- diture</u>	<u>Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)</u>
Vista Irriga- tion District	CA	37,000	24,000	1	1	Negotiated	5	Yes	4.00/AUM	5	No	Yes	No Record	60,000	None	No
Windsor Co. Water District	CA	180	No Record	1	1	Negotiated	1	Yes	Variable	3	No	No	No Record	0	Yes No Record	No
Yuba County Water District	CA	100	No Record	2	2	Board Set	3	No	5.86/Ac 180/Ac <sup>1</sup>	Unknown	Un- known	Un- known	No Record	1,425	None	Un- known
Boulder Water Department	CO	5,730	1,450	15	15	Bids	1	Yes	7.00/AUM	3	Yes	No	No Record	11,500	None	Yes
City of Colo- rado Springs	CO	407	No Record	1	1	Bids	3	No	8,050/ Lease	3	No	No	No Record	8,050 <sup>2</sup>	None	No
Cities of Fort Collins & Greeley (administered jointly)	CO	325	No Record	1	2	Negotiated	1	Yes	3.75/Ac	1	No	Yes	0	1,220	None	No
Denver Water Department	CO	7,625	No Record	13	13	Bids, Private rates, Negotiated	2	Yes	.95/Ac	1 to 5	Yes	Yes	No Record	22,190	3,000	No
Northern Colo. Water Cons. District	CO	1,488	No Record	1	1	Bids	1	Yes	22,000 for ranch	3	No	Yes	No Record	22,000 <sup>3</sup>	3,500	No

<sup>1</sup>Probably not grazing

<sup>2</sup>Includes hay land

<sup>3</sup>Includes hay

Grazing Lease Information

Local Governments

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures \$	Yes	Rebate No	Amount	Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:		
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %					A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both
CA	Vista Irrigation District	X		60,000		100	None		X			X				X			X	
CA	Windsor Co. Water District	X		0		100	0		X		X					X			X	
CA	Yuba County Water District	X		1,425		100	None		X		X	X						X		
CO	Boulder Water Department	X				100	None		X		X	X						X		
CO	City of Colorado Springs	X		100			None		X		X	X					X		X	
CO	Cities of Fort Collins and Greeley (Administered jointly)	X		1,220		100	None		X		X						X		X	
CO	Denver Water Department	X		100%	25	75	2,750		X		X	X					X		X	
CO	Northern Colorado Water Cons. District	X		22,000		100	2,250		X		X						X		X	

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

**GRAZING INFORMATION**

<u>Agency/Region/ Project</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Acres Grazed</u>	<u>No. AUM's</u>	<u>Leases</u>	<u>Lessees</u>	<u>Fee Determi- nation</u>	<u>Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)</u>	<u>Other Factors Consi- dered</u>	<u>Typical Fee and Basis \$</u>	<u>Lease Term</u>	<u>Term Varia- ble</u>	<u>Lessee Other Rights</u>	<u>Opera- tion Costs \$</u>	<u>Total Grazing Income \$</u>	<u>Range Improve- ment Expen- diture</u>	<u>Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)</u>
Pueblo Water Department	CO	1,132	No Record	1	1	Bids	5	Yes	1.00/Ac	5	No	Yes	No Record	1,130	5,000	No
Boise Project Board of Control	ID	100	No Record	9	9	Bids	5	No	10.11/Ac	5	No	Yes	No Record	1,000	None	No
Lewiston-Orchards Irrigation District	ID	401	140	1	1	Bids	1	No	1.25/Ac	1	No	No	No Record	500	None	Yes
Central Platte NRD	NE	600	No Record	2	2	Bids	1	No	18.00/Acre	1	No	No	No Record	14,000	None	Yes
City of Alliance	NE	3,444	No Record	2	2	Bids	5	No	6.50/Ac	5	No	No	No Record	25,000	None	No
City of North Platte	NE	20	No Record	1	1	Bids	1	No	5.00/Acre	1	No	No	No Record	100	None	No
City of Scottsbluff	NE	80	No Record	1	1	Negotiated	5	Yes	900.00/ lease	5	No	No	No Record	900	None	No
Lower Big Blue NRD	NE	55	90	1	1	Private rates	1	No	20.00/Ac	1	No	No	No Record	1,100	None	Yes
Pershing County Water Conservation District	NV	30,000	15,000	1	1	Break even to cover costs	1	Yes	1.96/Ac	5	No	No	45,758	58,807	27,479	No

<sup>1</sup> Includes farmland (40 acres)

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
**LOCAL GOVERNMENTS**

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures Agency %	Agency Improvement Expenditures \$	Rebate Yes	Tenure Rights* A    B    C    D	Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:		
		Yes	No	Amount					Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both
CO	Pueblo Water Department	X			100	5,000	X	X		X		X		X
ID	Boise Project Board of Control	X			100	None	X			X		X		X
ID	Lewiston Orchard Irrigation District	X			100	None	X			X		X		X
NE	Central Platte NRD	X			100	None	X			X		X		X
NE	City of Alliance	X	25,000		100	None	X			X		X		X
NE	City of North Platte	X	100		100	None	X			X		X		X
NE	City of Scottsbluff	X	900		100	None	X			X		X		X
NE	Lower Big Blue NRD	X	1,100		100	None	X			X		X		X
NV	Pershing County Water Conservation District	X	58,807	100		17,579	X			X		X		X

\*For Tenure Rights:  
 A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUM's	LEASES		Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
				Leases	Lessees											
Truckee-Carson Irrigation District	NV	6,000	No Record	32	32	Board set	1	No	4.50/AUM 1.50/Acre	1	No	No	No Record	6,744	No Record	No
Arch Hurley Cons. District	NM	454	200	1	1	Bids	2	No	3.00/AUM	2	No	Yes	No Record	600	0	Yes
Gallup Municipal Water System	NM	960	No Record	1	1	Set years ago	Never	No	.03/Acre	1	No	No Record	None	25	None	No
Roswell	NM	3,500	No Record	1	1	Bids	5	Yes	.97/Acre	5	No	No	No Record	3,400	None	No
City of Medford	OR	563 <sup>1</sup>	943	3	3	Bids	1	No	8.22/AUM	1	No	Yes	No Record	4,000	5,300	Yes
Westland Irrigation District	OR	120	No Record	1	1	Negotiated	Hasn't been changed for years	Yes	1.00/Acre	1	No	Yes	No Record	120	None	No
City of Brookings	SD	40	No Record	1	1	Private rates	3	Yes	26.00/Ac	3	No	Yes	No Record	1,040	None	Yes
City of Miller	SD	180	No Record	1	1	Bids	3	No	6.22/Ac	3	No	No	No Record	1,120	None	No
City of Bellevue	WA	15 to 18	No Record	1	1	Private rates	1	No	280.00/Lease	1	No	No	No Record	280	None	No

<sup>1</sup> Includes 80 acres which are hayed and grazed.

GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures \$	Rebate Yes No	Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:		
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %			A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both
NV	Truckee-Carson Irrigation District	X		6,744		100	None	X		X			X					
NM	Arch Hurley Conservation District	X		600		100	None		X		X		X					X
NM	Gallup Municipal Water System	X		25		100	None		X		X			X				X
NM	Roswell	X		3,400		100	None		X		X		X					X
OR	City of Medford	X			50	50		X		3,478		X			X			X
OR	Westland Irrigation District	X				100	None		X		X				X			X
SD	City of Brookings	X				100	None		X		X			X				X
SD	City of Miller	X		1,120	50	50	None		X		X			X				X
WA	City of Bellevue	X				100	None		X		X				X			X

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

D - OTHER  
 E - GRAZING PERMIT NUMBER OR NO RECORD  
 F - GRAZING PERMIT PER CATTLE UNIT OR EQUIVALENT  
 G - GRAZING PERMIT UNIT AREA  
 H - GRAZING PERMIT UNIT AREA

GRAZING LF  
LOCAL INFORMATION

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUH's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
City of Walla Walla	WA	10.75	No Record	2	2	Private rates	5	No	43.50/Ac	5	No	No	No Record	465	None	Yes
Ellensburg Water Department	WA	130	No Record	2	2	Auction, Private rates	1 to 4	No	1.55/Ac 33.75/Ac <sup>1</sup>	1 to 4	Yes	No	No Record	795	None	No
Longview Water Department	WA	9.5	No Record	2	2	Negotiation	1	Yes	5.00/AUM (33.68/Ac)	1	No	No	No Record	320	No Record	No
Seattle Water Department	WA	3,000	No Record	5	5	Private rates, BLM-USFS	1 to 4	No	.15/Acre 2.80/AUM	1 or 2	Yes	Yes	1,086	1,086	None	No
Deaver Irriga- tion District	WY	20,095	No Record	30	30	BLM rates	8	Yes	.04/Acre	5	No	Yes	98	983	None	No

<sup>1</sup>Irrigated

GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Rebate			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:		
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both		
WA	City of Walla Walla	X			100		None		X		X				X		X		X			
WA	Ellensburg Water Department	X			100		None		X		X				X		X		X			
WA	Longview Water Department	X		320	100		No Record		X		X				X		X		X			
WA	Seattle Water Department	X		1,086	100		None		X		X				X		X		X			
WY	Deaver Irrigation District	X		98	100		None		X		X				X		X		X			

\*For Tenure Rights:  
A - Present tenant has all rights  
B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
D - Other

**APPENDIX B**  
**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
**SECTION II**

**FEDERAL AGENCIES**

State	Name of Grazing Lease	Address	Agency	Grazing Fees		Number of Acres	Number of Horses	Number of Cattle	Number of Sheep	Number of Goats	Number of Pigs	Number of Hounds	Number of Other	Total Number of Animals	Total Value	Value per Animal	Number of Horses	Number of Cattle	Number of Sheep	Number of Goats	Number of Pigs	Number of Hounds	Number of Other	Total Number of Animals	Total Value	Value per Animal			
				Annual	Semi-annual																								
Alaska	Alaska State Grazing Lease	1000 N. 10th Street Anchorage, Alaska 99501	State of Alaska	\$1,000	\$500	100	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	\$1,000	\$2,500	\$2,500	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	\$1,000	\$2,500	\$2,500
Arizona	Central Arizona Plateau Forest Service	Box 1000 Flagstaff, Arizona 86001	U.S. Forest Service	\$12,000	\$6,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000
Arkansas	Southern Arkansas Plateau Forest Service	Box 1000 Rogers, Arkansas 72701	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
California	Central California Forest Service	Box 1000 Fresno, California 93701	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Colorado	Colorado Plateau Forest Service	Box 1000 Grand Junction, Colorado 81501	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Connecticut	Connecticut River Forest Service	Box 1000 Hartford, Connecticut 06101	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Delaware	Delaware River Forest Service	Box 1000 Wilmington, Delaware 19801	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Florida	Florida Panhandle Forest Service	Box 1000 Tallahassee, Florida 32301	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Georgia	Georgia-Okefenokee Forest Service	Box 1000 Milledgeville, Georgia 31061	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Hawaii	Hawaiian Islands Forest Service	Box 1000 Honolulu, Hawaii 96801	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Idaho	Idaho Plateau Forest Service	Box 1000 Boise, Idaho 83701	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Illinois	Illinois River Forest Service	Box 1000 Springfield, Illinois 62701	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Indiana	Indiana River Forest Service	Box 1000 Bloomington, Indiana 47401	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Iowa	Iowa River Forest Service	Box 1000 Des Moines, Iowa 50301	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Kansas	Kansas River Forest Service	Box 1000 Topeka, Kansas 66601	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Louisiana	Mississippi River Forest Service	Box 1000 Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70801	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Maine	Maine Woods Forest Service	Box 1000 Augusta, Maine 04330	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Maryland	Maryland River Forest Service	Box 1000 Annapolis, Maryland 20701	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Massachusetts	Massachusetts River Forest Service	Box 1000 Boston, Massachusetts 02101	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Michigan	Michigan River Forest Service	Box 1000 Lansing, Michigan 48901	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Minnesota	Minnesota River Forest Service	Box 1000 St. Paul, Minnesota 55101	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Mississippi	Mississippi River Forest Service	Box 1000 Jackson, Mississippi 39201	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Missouri	Missouri River Forest Service	Box 1000 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Montana	Montana River Forest Service	Box 1000 Helena, Montana 59601	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Nebraska	Nebraska River Forest Service	Box 1000 Lincoln, Nebraska 68501	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Nevada	Nevada River Forest Service	Box 1000 Carson City, Nevada 89701	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
New Hampshire	New Hampshire River Forest Service	Box 1000 Concord, New Hampshire 03301	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
New Jersey	New Jersey River Forest Service	Box 1000 Trenton, New Jersey 08601	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
New Mexico	New Mexico River Forest Service	Box 1000 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
New York	New York River Forest Service	Box 1000 Albany, New York 12201	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
North Carolina	North Carolina River Forest Service	Box 1000 Raleigh, North Carolina 27601	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
North Dakota	Missouri River Forest Service	Box 1000 Bismarck, North Dakota 58501	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Ohio	Ohio River Forest Service	Box 1000 Columbus, Ohio 43201	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Oklahoma	Oklahoma River Forest Service	Box 1000 Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73101	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Oregon	Oregon River Forest Service	Box 1000 Portland, Oregon 97201	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania River Forest Service	Box 1000 Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Rhode Island	Rhode Island River Forest Service	Box 1000 Providence, Rhode Island 02901	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000	\$7,500	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
South Carolina	South Carolina River Forest Service	Box 1000 Columbia, South Carolina 29201	U.S. Forest Service	\$15,000</																									

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	GRAZING LEV-		INFORMATION											
			No. AUH's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
<u>Agricultural Research Service</u>																
Central Plains Experimental Range	CO	15,500	5,400	1	1	U.S.F.S. Grassland Fee	1	No	4.50/AUM	10	No	No	No Record	20,250	4,000	Yes
Southern Great Plains Field Station	OK	5,235	6,120	1	1	Private rates	1	Yes	5.70/AUM	1 (long term renewal)	No	No	No Record	40,000	No Record	No
Jornada Experimental Range	NM	145,000	700 AU's	1	1	Formula	1	No	50.00/AUM	10	No	No	No Record	33,700	No Record	Yes

**Grazing Lease Information**  
U.S. Department of Agriculture

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures		Rebate			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:		
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both	

**Agricultural Research Service**

CO	Central Plains Experimental Range	X	15,187	100		4,000	-No Record-		X			X			X			X
OK	Southern Great Plains Field Station	X	40,000	100		N/A			X			X	X					X
NM	Jornada Experimental Range	X	33,700	100		No Record			X			X	X					X

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights

- B - Present tenant has first right of refusal
- C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis
- D - Other

GRAZING INFORMATION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUH's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
<b>U.S. Air Force*</b>																
Los Angeles District	CA						2	Yes		5	No	No	No Record	170,048	23,690	Yes
March Air Force Base		1,725	No Record	2	2	Bids			12.33/Ac					(21,267)	(0)	
March Communi- cations Facil Annex		88.5	No Record	1	1	Bids			20.00/Ac					(1,769)	(0)	
Vandenberg AFB		13,108	10,154	2	2	Bids			14.48/AUM					(147,012)	(23,690)	
Federal Prison		40,345				Negotiated								98,430	90,000	No
Sacramento District						Bids	5	No		5	No	No	No Record			
Beale AFB		10,407	7,343	4	3				12.48/AUM					(91,676)	(90,000)	
Davis Comms Annex		309	No Record	1	1				17.00/Ac					(5,253)	(0)	
Lincoln Comm. Annex		358	No Record	1	1				Non-spe- cified					(1)	(0)	
Travis AFB		145	No Record	1	1				10.34/Ac					(1,500)	(0)	
Omaha District	CO															
Lowry AFB		3,217	No Record	1	1	Bids	5	No	2.00/Ac	5	No	No	No Record	6,435	No Record	Yes

\*Administered by the Army Corps of Engineers

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Rebate			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:		
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency	Rancher	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both		
<b>U.S. Air Force**</b>																						
CA	Los Angeles District	X			50	50		None	X		23,690			X				X	X			
	March Air Force Base																					
	March Communications Facil Annex																					
	Vandenberg AFB																					
Federal Prison																						
CA	Sacramento District	X			100		No Record	X		90,000			X		X			X				
	Beale AFB																					
	Davis Comm. Annex																					
	Lincoln Comm. Annex																					
Travis AFB																						
CO	Omaha District	X			100		No Record						X		X			X				
	Lowry AFB																					

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

\*\*Administered by the Army Corps of Engineers

		GRAZING LE U.S. DEPARTM				'FORMATION DEFENSE										
Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUH's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
<b>U.S. Air Force*</b>																
Albuquerque District	NM															
Cannon AFB (Melrose RN)		17,169	64 AU's <sup>1</sup>	8	8	Bid, Negoti- ated	5	Yes	5.00/AUM	5	Yes	No	No Record	17,497	0	Yes
Omaha District	ND															
Minot AFB		228	No	1	1	Bids	5	No	4.55/Ac	5	No	No	No Record	1,038	No Record	Yes
Tulsa District	OK															
Kegelman Air Force Auxiliary Field		3	No Record	1	1	Bid	5	No	1.67/Ac	5	No	No	No Record	5.00	None	No

\*Administered by Army Corps of Engineers

<sup>1</sup>64 AU's on one lease (2,560 Ac) at \$5.00 per AUM

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Rebate			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:		
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both		
<b>U.S. Air Force**</b>																						
NM	Albuquerque District	X			100		None	X		No Record				X	X	X			X			
	Cannon AFB (Melrose RN)																					
ND	Omaha District	X			100		No Record	-No Record-						X	X	X			X			
	Minot AFB																					
OK	Tulsa District	X			100		None		X					X	X	X			X			
	Kegelman Air Force Auxillary Field																					

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

\*\*Administered by the Army Corps of Engineers

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUM's	Leases	Lessees	Determi- nation	GRAZING I DEPART:		INFORMATION DEFENSE			Operation Costs	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)	
							Fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consid- ered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term					
<b>U.S. Army*</b>																
Phoenix District	AZ															
Navaho Ordnance Depot		19,933	1,200	1	1	Bid	5	No	10.56/AUM	5	No	No	No Record	1,882	10,498	No
Sacramento District	CA					Bid	5	No		5	No	No	No Record			
Hunter Liggett Military Reservation		100,200	35,533	4	4				9.85/AUM					349,995	42,600	
Fort Ord		6,000	2,700	1	1				8.25/AUM					22,275	0	
Camp Parks		973	1,460	1	1				12.53/AUM					18,300	2,000	
Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant		34	**	1	1				27.80/Ac					945	0	86
Camp Roberts		36,091	10,900	3	2				23.35/AUM					254,612	82,000	
Santa Rosa Radio Station		85		1	1				9.66/Ac					825	0	

\*Administered by Army Corps of Engineers

\*\*No limit; irrigated pasture

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:			
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both
<u>U.S. Army**</u>																				
AZ	Phoenix District	X		***	100		0	X		10,498				X					X	
	Navajo Ordinance Depot																			
CA	Sacramento District	X			100		0	X		126,600				X					X	
	Hunter Liggett Military Reservation									(42,600)										
	Fort Ord									0										
	Camp Parks									(2,000)										
	Riverbank Army Ammo Plant									0										
	Camp Roberts									(82,000)										
	Santa Rosa Radio Station									0										

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

\*\*Administered by the Army Corps of Engineers  
 \*\*\*Agency External fences; Rancher Internal fences.

**GRAZING INFORMATION  
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

<u>Agency/Region/ Project</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Acres Grazed</u>	<u>No. AUM's</u>	<u>Leases</u>	<u>Lessees</u>	<u>Fee Determi- nation</u>	<u>Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)</u>	<u>Other Factors Consi- dered</u>	<u>Typical Fee and Basis</u>	<u>Lease Term</u>	<u>Term Varia- ble</u>	<u>Lessee</u>	<u>Other Rights</u>	<u>Opera- tion Costs</u>	<u>Total Grazing Income</u>	<u>Range Improve- ment Expen- diture</u>	<u>Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)</u>
<b>U.S. Army*</b>																	
Omaha District	CO																
U.S. Army Depot Activity Pueblo		8,214	No Record	1	1	Bids	5	No	3.04/Ac	5	No	No	No Record	25,000		Yes	
Kansas City District	KS																
Sunflower Army Ammo Plant		680	No Record	4	2	Bid	5	No	9.60/Acre	5	Yes	No	No Record	6,526	0	No	
Omaha District	NE																
Cornhusker Army Ammo Plant		2,017	No Record	6	4	Bid	5	No	19.70/Ac	5	No	No	No Record	39,734		Yes	
Tulsa District	OK																
McAlester Army Ammo Depot		6,500		1	1	Bid	5	No	.27/Ac	5	No	No	No Record	1,755	No Record	No	
Sacramento District	UT																
Tooele Army Depot		20,925 <sup>1</sup>	5,670	2	2	Bid	5	No	7.37/AUM	5	No	No	No Record	44,107	0	No	

\*Administered by the Army Corps of Engineers

<sup>1</sup>One lease (880 Ac) includes farming and grazing

GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:				
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency	Rancher	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both	
<u>U.S. Army**</u>																					
CO	Omaha District		X			100									-No Record-			X	X	X	
	U.S. Army Depot Activity Pueblo																				X
KS	Kansas City District		X		50	50				0	X			No Record			X		X		X
	Sunflower Army Ammunition Plant																				X
NE	Omaha District		X			100								-No Record-			X	X	X		X
	Cornhusker Army Ammunition Plant																				ICT
OK	Tulsa District		X				No Record			No Record			-No Record-			X		X			X
	McAlester Army Ammunition Depot																				
UT	Sacramento District																				
	Tooele Army Depot																				
	-See California, Sacramento District-																				

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

\*\*Administered by the Army Corps of Engineers

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUM's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	GRAZING LT DEPARTM.		INFORMATION DEFENSE			Operation- Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
								Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights				
<b>U.S. Army*</b>																
Seattle District	WA															
Fort Lewis		151.2	No Record	1	1	Bid	5	No	1.49/Ac	5	No	No	No Record	225	0	Yes
Fort William Henry Harrison		667	No Record	1	1	Bid	5	No	12.83/Ac	5	No	No	No Record	8,560		Yes
Yakima Firing Range		212,651	No Record	6	3	Bid	5	No	4.35/AUM	5	No	No	No Record	105,278	64,380	Yes
Omaha District	WY															
Sheridan Army National Guard		3,960		1	1	Bid	5	No	3.34/Ac	5	No	No	No Record	13,222		Yes
Lander National Guard		1,360 <sup>1</sup>		1	1	1	5	Yes	-	5	No	Yes	No Record	0	0	Yes
Lovell National Guard		0 <sup>2</sup>		1	1	2	Indefinite	Yes	-	Indefinite	Yes	No	No Record	0	0 <sup>2</sup>	Yes

\*Administered by Army Corps of Engineers

<sup>1</sup>Leased to a non-profit organization

<sup>2</sup>Administered by Department of Interior

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:		
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher
<b>U.S. Army**</b>																			
WA	Seattle District																		
	Fort Lewis	X			100		None		X				X		X				X
	Fort William Henry Harrison	X			100				X				X		X				X
	Yakima Firing Range	X			100		None	X		64,380			X		X				X
WY	Omaha District	X			100			-No Record-			X	X	X						X
	Sheridan Army National Guard																		
	Lander National Guard																		
	Lovell National Guard																		

\*For Tenure Rights:  
A - Present tenant has all rights  
B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
D - Other

\*For Tenure Rights:  
A - Present tenant has all rights  
B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
D - Other

\*\*Administered by the Army Corps of Engineers

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

<u>Agency/Region/ Project</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Acres Grazed</u>	<u>No. AUM's</u>	<u>Leases</u>	<u>Lessees</u>	<u>Fee Determi- nation</u>	<u>Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)</u>	<u>Other Factors Consi- dered</u>	<u>Typical Fee and Basis \$</u>	<u>Lease Term</u>	<u>Term Varia- ble</u>	<u>Lessee Other Rights</u>	<u>Opera- tion Costs \$</u>	<u>Total Grazing Income \$</u>	<u>Range Improve- ment Expen- diture</u>	<u>Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)</u>
<u><b>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</b></u>																
Los Angeles District	CA															
Prado Flood Control Basin		539	No Record	4	4	Bid	5	No	13.35/AUM	5	No	No	No Record	7,195	0	No
Sacramento District	CA					Bid	5	No		5	No	No	No Record			No
Black Butte Lake		4,202	2,624	4	4				13.20/AUM					34,650	12,000	
Farmington Dam		263	300	1	1				11.48/AUM					3,445	No Record	
New Hogan Lake		779	No Record	3	3				6.42/Ac					5,005	No Record	
Success Lake		1,453	No Record	5	5				4.45/Ac					6,459	No Record	
Terminus Dam		149	116 <sup>1</sup>	2	2				4.00/AUM					589	No Record	
Walla Walla District	ID															
Lucky Peak Dam		100 <sup>2</sup>		1	1	Private rates	5	Yes	13.25/AUM	5	No	No	No Report	60	None	No

<sup>1</sup>AUM's for 93 acres

<sup>2</sup>All irrigated

GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
 U.S. DEPART. OF DEFENSE

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:			
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both
<u>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</u>																				
CA	Los Angeles District																	X	X	
	Prado Flood Control Basin	X			50	50				None	-No Record-				X			X	X	
CA	Sacramento District	X			100					No Record	X			No Record		X	X		X	
	Black Butte Lake							0			12,000									
	Farmington Dam																			
	New Hogan Lake																			
	Success Lake																			
	Terminus Dam																			
ID	Walla Walla District																			
	Lucky Peak Dam	X			100					None	-No Record-				X			X		

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
**U.S. DEPART' OF DEFENSE**

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUH's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
<b>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</b>																
Kansas City District	KS					Bid	5	No		5	Yes	No	No Record		No Record	No
Hillside Lake		65		2	2				5.00/Ac					325		
Kanopolis Lake		11		1	1				6.31/Ac					70		
Melvern Lake		7.5		1	1				4.00/Ac					30		
Milford Lake		1,019		9	7				6.37/Ac					6,494		
Perry Lake		474		7	6				6.11/Ac					2,897		
Pomona Lake		400		8	8				3.74/Ac					1,495		
Tuttle Creek Lake		123		2	2				.61/Ac					75		
Tulsa District	KS					Bid	5	No		5	Yes	No	No Record		No Record	Yes
Council Grove Lake		58		1	1				4.43/Ac					257		
Elk City Lake		203		3	3				.70/Ac					143		
Fall River Lake		200		4	3				2.18/Ac					437		
Marion Lake		15		1	1				3.33/Ac					50		
Toronto Lake		20		6	6				13.80/Ac					276		

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Rebate			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:			
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency	Rancher	%	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both		
<u>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</u>																							
KS	Kansas City District	X			100			No Record	X			No Record			X		X						X
	Hillside Lake																						
	Kanopolis Lake																						
	Melvern Lake																						
	Milford Lake																						
	Perry Lake																						
	Pomona Lake																						
	Tuttle Creek Lake																						
KS	Tulsa District	X			100			No Record	X			No Record			X	X		X					X
	Council Grove Lake																						
	Elk City Lake																						
	Fall River Lake																						
	Marion Lake																						
	Toronto Lake																						

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

**GRAZING INFORMATION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

<u>Agency/Region/ Project</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Acres Grazed</u>	<u>No. AUH's</u>	<u>Leases</u>	<u>Lessees</u>	<u>Fee Determi- nation</u>	<u>Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)</u>	<u>Other Factors Consi- dered</u>	<u>Typical Fee and Basis \$</u>	<u>Lease Term</u>	<u>Term Varia- ble</u>	<u>Lessee Other Rights</u>	<u>Opera- tion Costs \$</u>	<u>Total Grazing Income \$</u>	<u>Range Improve- ment Expen- diture</u>	<u>Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)</u>
<b>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</b>																
Albuquerque District	NM															
Santa Rosa Lake		2,004	45 AU's	1	1	Bid with negotiations	5	Yes	.44/Ac (1.67/AUM)	5	No	No	No Record	900	None in 1981	Yes
Omaha District	ND															
Bowman-Haley Dam		900	No Record	8	6				3.30/Ac					2,970		
Garrison Dam/ Lake Sakakawea		11,585	No Record	95	74				2.16/Ac					24,969		
Tulsa District	OK		No Record			Bid	5	No		5	Yes	No	No Record		No Record	Yes
Candy Lake		717		3	2				4.59/Ac					3,289		
Canton Lake		2,538		3	3				3.66/Ac					9,300		
Coran Lake		1,269		7	7				7.56/Ac					9,599		
Eufaula Lake		7,880		40	39				2.37/Ac					18,685		
Fort Gibson Lake		11,297		87	85				3.53/Ac					39,921		
Hugo Lake		1,977		5	4				.68/Ac					1,344		
Hulah Lake		3,996		16	14				2.41/Ac					9,630		

Grazing Lease Information  
U.S. Department of Defense

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:				
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency	Rancher	%	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both
<u>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</u>																					
NM	Albuquerque District				Santa Rosa Lake	X		100	None	X	No Record		X		X				X		
ND	Omaha District				Bowman-Haley Dam	X		100	No Record	X	No Record		X		X				X		
					Garrison Dam/Lake Sakakawea																
OK	Tulsa District				Candy Lake	X		100	No Record	X	No Record		X	X		X				X	
					Canton Lake																
					Coran Lake																
					Eufaula Lake																
					Ft. Gibson Lake																
					Hugo Lake																
					Hulah Lake																

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

GRAZING LAND INFORMATION U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE												Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improvement Expenditure	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUH's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	
<u>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</u>														
Tulsa District	OK		No Record			Bid	5	No		5	Yes	No	No Record	No Record
Kaw Lake		872		2	2				6.77/Ac					5,904
Keystone Lake		5,950		2	2				2.35/Ac					13,981
Lake Texoma- Red River		32,388		99	83				2.24/Ac					72,510
Oologa Lake		981		12	12				3.64/Ac					3,570
Robert S. Kerr Lock/ Dam		1,841		27	26				4.90/Ac					9,028
Skiatook Lake		6,550		11	9				1.00/Ac					6,520
Tenkiller Ferry Lake		4,800		45	44				3.12/Ac					14,972
W.D. Mayo Lake/ Dam		20		1	1				13.80/Ac					276
Webbers Falls Lake/Dam		433		9	9				6.00/Ac					2,600
Wister Lake		12,066		79	75				1.72/Ac					20,695

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures		Rebate			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:		
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both	
<b>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</b>																					
OK	Tulsa District	X			100		No Record	X			No Record	X	X	X						X	
	Kaw Lake																				
	Keystone Lake																				
	Lake Texoma-Red River																				
	Oologa Lake																				
	Robert S. Kerr Lock/Dam																				
	Skiatook Lake																				
	Tenkkiller Ferry Lake																				
	W.D. Mayo Lake/Dam																				
	Webers Falls Lake/Dam																				
	Wister Lake																				

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

<u>Agency/Region/ Project</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Acres Grazed</u>	<u>No. AUM's</u>	<u>Leases</u>	<u>Lessees</u>	<u>Fee Determi- nation</u>	<u>Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)</u>	<u>Other Factors Consi- dered</u>	<u>Typical Fee and Basis \$</u>	<u>Lease Term</u>	<u>Term Varia- ble</u>	<u>Lessee Other Rights</u>	<u>Opera- tion Costs \$</u>	<u>Total Grazing Income \$</u>	<u>Range Improve- ment Expen- diture</u>	<u>Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)</u>
<b>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</b>																
Portland District	OR															
Green Peter Foster Lakes		60	30	1	1	Bid	5	No	4.25/AUM	5	No	Yes	No Record	128	None	No
Omaha District	SD		No Record			Bid	5	No		5	No	No	No Record	198,000		Yes
Big Bend Dam		1,295		13	10									2,178		
Ft. Randall Dam		11,258		62	58									20,201		
Gavins Point Dam		35		2	2									145		
Oahe Dam and Lake		22,659		74	71									35,152		
Walla Walla District	WA															
Little Goose Lock and Dam		40	No Record	2	2	Private rates	5	Yes	6.50/AUM	5	No	No	No Record	650	None	No

<sup>1</sup> Includes all improvements by Omaha District (Army, Air Force and Civil Works)

GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures Agency % Rancher %	Agency Improvement Expenditures \$	Rebate Yes No Amount	Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By: Agency Both	Length of Use Determined By: Agency Both
		Yes	No	Amount				A	B	C	D		
<u>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</u>													
OR	Portland District												
	Green Peter Foster Lakes	X		100	None	X			X		X		X
SD	Omaha District	X		100	198,000**	X		No Record		X		X	X
	Big Bend Dam												
	Ft. Randall Dam												
	Gavins Point Dam												
	Oahe Dam and Lake												
WA	Walla Walla District												
	Little Goose Lock and Dam	X		100	None	-No Record-			X		X		X

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

\*\*Total for Omaha District Civil Works and Military Leases.

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUM's	Leases	Leesees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical			Operation Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)	
									Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights				
<b>U.S. Navy and U.S. Marine Corps*</b>																
Camp Pendleton	CA	31,410	8,360	3	2	Bid	5	No	6.33/AUM	5 (1 with option for 4)	Yes	No	50,000	235,531	242,652	Yes
Concord Weapons Station		5,469	8,337	65	4	Bid	5	No	15.38/AUM	5 (See above)	Yes	No		52,941	128,230	
Fallbrook Weapons Station		7,592	2,000	1	1	Bid	5	No	4.85/AUM	5 (See above)	Yes	No		9,700		
Naval Shipyard Mare Island		273	480	1	1	Bid	5	No	6.25/AUM	5 (See above)	Yes	No		3,000		
Boardman Bombing Range	OR	40,324	3,370	2	1	Bid	5	No	12.11/AUM	5 (See above)	Yes	No		40,810		
Manchester Fuel Depot	WA	194	235	1	1	Bid	5	No	2.13/AUM	5 (See above)	Yes	No		500		
Whidbey Island Naval Air Station		556	850	2	2	Bid	5	No	1.86/AUM	5 (See above)	Yes	No		1,580		

\*All administered by Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Western Division, San Bruno, CA.

**Grazing Lease Information**  
**U.S. Department of Defense**

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Rebate Yes	Rebate No	Amount	Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:		
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	\$	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both		
	<u>U.S. Navy and U.S. Marine Corps**</u>	X		100			242,652	X		No Record		X		X		X		X		X		
CA	Camp Pendleton																					
	Concord Weapons Station																					
	Fallbrook Weapons Station																					
	Naval Shipyard Mare Island																					
OR	Boardman Bombing Range																					
WA	Manchester Fuel Depot																					
	Whidbey Island Naval Air Station																					

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

\*\*All administered by Naval Facilities Engineering Command,  
 Western Division, San Bruno, CA.

GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUM's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
<b>Bureau of Indian Affairs</b>																
Central California Agency	CA	3,340	No Record	2	1	Bid	1	No		1	No	No	130	13,000	No Record	Yes
Fort Hall Agency	ID	No Record	17,380	19	18	Bid	1	No	8.00/AUM	5	No	Yes	No Record	8,220	No Record	No
Horton Agency	KS	15,000	No Record	300	No Record	Bid, Negotiated	3	No	80.00-90.00/AU	3	Yes	No	No Record	No Record	No Record	Yes
Blackfeet Agency <sup>1</sup>	MT	No Record	No Record	1,430	400	Bid	1	No	6.00/AUM	5	Yes	No	47,500	2,584,804	50,000	Yes
Crow Agency																
Permits		52,988	17,243	31	27	Bid	1	No	No Record	5	No	Yes	No Record	42,504	7,000	Yes
Leases		707,971	235,990	3,895	500	Bid	1	No	3.00/AUM	5	Yes	No	No Record	1,869,866	13,000	No Record
Flathead Reservation <sup>2</sup>																
Permits		15,710	2,000	7	14	Bid	1	No	4.10/AUM	5	No	No	No Record	8,220	None	Yes
Leases		No Record	No Record	781	760	Bid	1	No	1.00/Acre	5	No	No	No Record	No Record	No Record	Yes

<sup>1</sup> Includes range permits and farm-pasture leases

<sup>2</sup> Permits reported not leases which includes co-op land

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:			
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency	Rancher	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both
<b><u>Bureau of Indian Affairs</u></b>																				
CA	Central California Agency	X		1%		100				No Record		X			X	X			X	
ID	Fort Hall Agency		X			100			50%		X			X	X	X			X	
KS	Horton Agency		X			100			No Record	X			No Record		X			X		X
MT	Blackfeet Agency		X			100			50,000		X			X				X		X
MT	Crow Agency		X			100			19,000		X			X		X		X		X
MT	Flathead Reservation		X		25	75			No Record		X			X				X		X

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUM's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
<b>Bureau of Indian Affairs</b>																
Fort Belknap	MT															
Permits		361,634	73,145	109	66	Bid	1	No	6.46/AUM	10	Yes	No	59,800	431,414	87,000	No Record
Leases		84,235	17,190	95	40	Bid	1	Yes	6.46/AUM	10	Yes	No	37,300	75,000	No Record	Yes
Fort Peck Reservation		630,805	123,138	1,345	1,433	Bid	1	No	7.00/AUM	5	No	No	No Record	800,736	200,000	Yes
Northern Cheyenne Agency		385,083	96,631	12	59	Bid	1	No	5.14/AUM	1	No	No	7,500	497,927	50,000	Yes
Rocky Boys Reservation		81,431	22,799	90	57	Bid	1	No	1.00/AUM	5	No	No	10,426	14,264	10,300	Yes

Includes change permits and range-improvement leases.

Permits reported as leases since includes all of them.

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR**

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Rebate			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:			
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency	Rancher	%	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both		
<b><u>Bureau of Indian Affairs</u></b>																							
MT	Fort Belknap																						
	Permits	X		50	50		87,000		X		X							X					X
	Leases	X		25	75		No Record		X		X							X					X
MT	Fort Peck Reservation	X			100		None		X		X	X											X
MT	Northern Cheyenne Agency	X			100		None		X		X	X											X
MT	Rocky Boys Reservation	X	426	20	80		10,300		X		X												X

\*For Tenure Rights:  
A - Present tenant has all rights  
B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
D - Other

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUM's	GRAZING LEA U.S. DEPART		FORMATION INTERIOR		Frequency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Considered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
				Leases	Lessees	Determi- nation											
<b>Bureau of Indian Affairs</b>																	
Nevada Agency	NV					Bid & Others	1	Yes			1	Yes	No	No Record		None	No
Pine Nut <sup>1</sup>		58,950	4,697	No Record	No Record	Bid					2.34/AUM				11,013		
Pyramid Lake		23,189	324	No Record	No Record	Bid					2.00/AUM				648		
Summit Lake		No Record	12,000	No Record	No Record	Bid					1.69/AUM				20,301		
Fort McDermitt		3,560	2,400	1	1	BLM					1.86/AUM				4,464		
Eastern Nevada Agency	NV/ UT	48,885	1,600	1	1	BLM	1	No	2.31/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	3,696	No Record	No	
Goshute																	
Eastern Navajo Agency	NM	1,370,965	1,071	906	2,170	Board set, Negotiated	No set time- not since 1974	No	.07/Ac	5	No	No	2,879	98,846	No Record	No	

<sup>1</sup>Last leased in 1980.

GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures		Rebate Yes	Tenure Rights* A	Tenure Rights* B	Tenure Rights* C	Tenure Rights* D	Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:			
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	\$	Yes						Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both	
<b>Bureau of Indian Affairs</b>																				
NV	Nevada Agency	X		No Record			100		None	-No Record-				X	X		X			
	Pine Nut																			
	Pyramid Lake																			
	Summit Lake																			
	Fort McDermitt																			
NV/ UT	Eastern Nevada Agency																			
	Goshute	X		79			100		None		X			-Administered by BLM-						
NM	Eastern Navajo Agency	X		2,879	10	90	No Record				X	X				X	X			
	Bluewater Agency																			

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

GRAZING LEA  
U.S. DEPARTM  
INFORMATION  
INTERIOR

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUH's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
<b>Bureau of Indian Affairs</b>																
Aberdeen Area Office <sup>1</sup>	ND	2,300,000 <sup>2</sup>	1,200,000	1,560	1,300	Bid	1	No	7.00/AUM	4	No	No	No Record	8,400,000	680,000	No Record
Fort Berthold																
Fort Totten																
Turtle Mountain																
Anadarko Agency	OK	334,656 <sup>3</sup>	No Record	3,708 <sup>3</sup>	550 <sup>3</sup>	Private rates	1	Yes	9.00- 15.00/Ac	1 to 5	Yes	No	No Record	5,500,000 <sup>3</sup>	No Record	No
Ardmore Agency		25,000 <sup>3</sup>	No Record	190 <sup>3</sup>	150 <sup>3</sup>	Bids, Private rates	1	No	6.00/Ac	3	No	Yes	No Record	120,000	None	No
Concho Agency		61,262 <sup>3</sup>	No Record	228 <sup>3</sup>	No Record	Private rates	1	Yes	9.00- 20.00/Ac	1 to 5	Yes	No	No Record	394,537 <sup>3</sup>	No Record	No
Miami Agency		2,796 <sup>3</sup>	No Record	48 <sup>3</sup>	43 <sup>3</sup>	Bid, Negotiated	1	No	12.00/Ac	5	Yes	Yes	No Record	24,479	None	No
Oklmulgee Agency		33,026 <sup>3</sup>	No Record	344 <sup>3</sup>	250 <sup>3</sup>	Bid, Negotiated	Varia- ble	Yes	2.50/Ac	1 to 3, 5	Yes	Yes	No Record	77,856 <sup>3</sup>	No Record	No

<sup>1</sup>Incluie South Dakota Reservations

<sup>2</sup>Only 30 percent for general public; remainder for Indians

<sup>3</sup>Not separated from Ag. Leases

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:			
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency	Rancher	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both
<b><u>Bureau of Indian Affairs</u></b>																				
ND	Aberdeen Area Office				100	680,000				X			X			X			X	
	Fort Berthold																			
	Fort Totten																			
	Turtle Mountain																			
OK	Anadarko Agency	X			-No Record-		No Record		-No Record-		X			X			X			123
OK	Ardmore Agency	X	15,000		100		None		-No Record-		X		X							
OK	Concho Agency	X	No Record		100		No Record		-No Record-		X		X							
OK	Miami Agency	X	No Record		100		No Record		-No Record-		X		X							
OK	Okmulgee Agency	X			100		No Record		X		X		X							

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

**GRAZING INFORMATION**  
**U.S. DEPA OF INTERIOR**

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUH's	Lessees	Leasees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Oper- ation Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
<b>Bureau of Indian Affairs</b>																
Osage Agency	OK	98,923 <sup>1</sup>	No Record	469 <sup>1</sup>	No Record	Private Rates, Bid	1	No	7.50/Ac	3, 10	Yes	Yes	No Record	673,093	None	No
Pawnee Agency		22,080 <sup>1</sup>	No Record	527 <sup>1</sup>	No Record	Private Rates	1	No	10.00/Ac	3 to 5	Yes	No	No Record	220,800	None	No
Shawnee Agency		25,930 <sup>1</sup>	No Record	354 <sup>1</sup>	150 <sup>1</sup>	Private Rates	1	No	10.00/Ac	1 to 5	Yes	No	No Record	No Record	No Record	No
Tahlequah Agency		17,382 <sup>1</sup>	No Record	109 <sup>1</sup>	No Record	Bid, Private Rates	5	No	5.00/AUM	5	No	Yes	No Record	90,000 <sup>1</sup>	12,000	Yes
Talahena Agency		28,578	No Record	627	No Record	Bid, Private Rates	1	No	1.25/Ac	1½-5	Yes	No	No Record	No Record	No Record	No
Wewoka Agency		6,776 <sup>1</sup>	No Record	82 <sup>1</sup>	No Record	Private Rates	1	Yes	3.25/Ac	1 to 5	Yes	No	No Record	28,327 <sup>1</sup>	None	No
Umatilla	OR	57,830	7,758	16	10	Bid	1	No	9.33/AUM	5	No	Yes	No Record	42,760	No Record	No

Not separated from Ag. Leases

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Rebate			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:			
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both
<b>Bureau of Indian Affairs</b>																							
OK	Osage Agency	X		No Record			100			None	-No Record-				X			-No Record-			-No Record-		
OK	Pawnee Agency	X		No Record			100			None	-No Record-				X					X			X
OK	Shawnee Agency	X		No Record			100			No Record	X		No Record								X		X
OK	Tahlequah Agency		X				100			None	X		12,000				X				X		X
OK	Talahena Agency		-No Record-				100			No Record	-No Record-				X	X		-No Record-			-No Record-		
OK	Wewoka Agency	X		No Record			100			None	X		No Record				X			X			X
OR	Umatilla		X				100			No Record		X					X	X		X			X

125

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

GRAZING LE<sup>T</sup>  
U.S. DEPAR<sup>T</sup>MENT OF INTERIOR

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUM's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
<b>Bureau of Indian Affairs</b>																
Aberdeen Area Office	SD													--See North Dakota, Aberdeen Area Office--		
Cheyenne River																
Crow Creek																
Lower Brule																
Pine Ridge																
Rosebud																
Standing Rock																
Colville	WA	1,011,495 <sup>1</sup>	23,264	11	13	Bid	1	No	5.50/AUM	5	No	Yes	No Record	90,884	None	No
Yakima		31,361	5,306	4	11	Bid	2	No	4.56/AUM	5	No	Yes	No Record	11,609	None	No

<sup>1</sup>Entire reservation grazed in common.

GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:			
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency	Rancher	\$	Yes	No	Rebate	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both
<u>Bureau of Indian Affairs</u>																				
SD	Aberdeen Area Office		X		100		680,000		X				X				X			X
	Cheyenne River																			
	Crow Creek																			
	Lower Brule																			
	Pine Ridge																			
	Rosebud																			
	Standing Rock																			
WA	Colville		X		100		None		X			X	X	X				X		
WA	Yakima		X		100		None		-No Record-			X	X	X				X		

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

**GRAZING LEASING INFORMATION**  
**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUM's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
<b>Bureau of Reclamation</b>																
Lower Colorado Region																
Gila	AZ	112														
--No Record; Administered by Bureau of Land Management--																
Salt River				7	4	State or BLM	1	Yes	1.43/AUM	1	No	Yes	No Record	3,390	None	No
Yuma	AZ/ CA	70														
--No Record; Administered by Bureau of Land Management--																
<b>Mid-Pacific Region</b>																
Auburn	CA	2,396	No Record	10	9	Private Rates	1 and 5	No	3.14/Ac	1	No	No		7,527	None	No
Folsom Dam		75	No Record	1	1	Bid	5	No	12.07/Ac	1	No	No	0	905	None	No
Fresno		3,439	4,800	9	7	Bid & Negotiated	5	Yes	4.54/Ac	1	No	No	No Record	14,303	12,000	No
Napa		3,045	No Record	6	6	Private Rates, Negotiated	1	Yes	2.50/Ac	1	No	Yes	No Record	6,663	2,500	No
Tracy		14,186	No Record	9	9	Bid	5	No	7.12/Ac	1	No	No	No Record	100,985	None	No
Willows		4,568	No Record	8	8	Bid, Negotiated	5	Yes	3.84/Ac	1	No	No	No Record	17,535	No Record	No

<sup>1</sup> One year with option to renew for one year

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures		Rebate			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:		
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both	
<b>Bureau of Reclamation</b>																					
Lower Colorado Region																					
AZ	Gila																				
AZ	Salt River	X		3,390	5	95		None			-No Record-					X				X	
AZ/ CA	Yuma										-No Record-										
<b>Mid-Pacific Region</b>																					
CA	Auburn		X		100			None			X		X					X		X	
CA	Folsom Dam		X		100			None			X		X	X			X			X	
CA	Fresno		-No Record-		100			2,400			X		X		X		X			X	
CA	Napa		X		100			1,000	X		No Record		X					X		X	
CA	Tracy		-No Record-		100			None		X		X		X			X			X	
CA	Willows		X		100			None		X		X		X				X		X	

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUM's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
<b>Bureau of Reclamation</b>																
Lower Missouri Region																
Narrows Unit	CO	800	600	1	1	Bid	5	No				Yes			No	
Upper Colorado Region																
Pine River <sup>1</sup>	CO	15	No Record	1	1	BLM, USFS	1	No	2.31/Ac	1	No	No	No Record	22,585	None	No
Pacific Northwest Region																
Boise	ID	3,090		25											No Record	Yes
Mann Creek		280		1												
Minidoka		17,141		35												
Upper Missouri Region																
All Projects and Units	MT ND SD WY	No Record	No Record	500	470	Bid, USFS, Negotiated	5	No	8.00/AUM 1.75/Ac	1	No	Yes	No Record	No Record	130,000	No
Upper Colorado Region																
Hammond	NM	139		3		--See Upper Colorado Region, Pine River--										

<sup>1</sup> For Upper Colorado Region

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:			
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both
<b>Bureau of Reclamation</b>																				
Lower Missouri Region																				
CO	Narrows Unit	-No Record-			100		None			X			X		X				X	
Upper Colorado Region																				
CO	Pine River	X			100		None			X	X	X	X		X				X	
ID	Pacific Northwest Region	-No Record-			100		No Record			X			X		X				X	
ID	Boise																			
ID	Mann Creek																			
ID	Minidoka																			
Upper Missouri Region																				
MT	All Projects and Units																			
ND																				
SD																				
WY																				
Upper Colorado Region																				
NM	Hammond	X			100		None			X		X	X		X				X	

\*For Tenure Rights:  
A - Present tenant has all rights  
B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
D - Other

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUM's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consid- ered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)												
<u>Bureau of Reclamation</u>																												
Southwest Region																												
Carlsbad - Fort Sumner	NM	36,460	235	20	20	Negotiation	1	Yes	40.00/AUM	1	No	Yes	No Record	9,400	No Record	Yes												
Tucumcari		810	No Record	2	2	Bid	1	Yes	1.89/Ac	1	No	Yes	No Record	1,432	No Record	Yes												
Mountain Park	OK	2,680	No Record	9	13	Bid	2	No	14.69/Ac	2	No	No	No Record	39,370	None	No												
Mid-Pacific Region																												
Klamath	OR	1,199	2,376	1	1	Bid	5	No	8.88/AUM			No	500	21,100	None	Yes												
Pacific Northwest Region																												
--See Pacific Northwest Region Idaho--																												
Baker	OR	20		1																								
Owyhee		11,523		14																								
Rogue River		202		5																								
Umatilla		40		1																								
Vale		2,830		6																								
Upper Colorado Region																												
--See Upper Colorado Region, Pine River, Colorado--																												
Central Utah	UT	26,864		3																								
Flaming Gorge	UT	480		1																								
Wyoming	WY																											
Weber River	UT	716		2																								
Provo River		5		2																								

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Rebate			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:				
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both	
<b>Bureau of Reclamation</b>																								
	Southwest Region		X			100				None		X				X	X		X			X		
NM	Carlsbad - Fort Sumner																							
NM	Tucumcari																							
OK	Mountain Park	X		100%	75	25		No Record		-No Record-						X	X					X		
<b>Mid-Pacific Region</b>																								
OR	Klamath	X			25	75		None		X						X	X					X		
	Pacific Northwest Region			No Record			100	No Record		X		No Record				X		X		X		X		
OR	Baker Owyhee Rogue River Umatilla Vale																							
	Upper Colorado Region	X			100		None			X		X	X	X								X		
UT	Central Utah																							
UT/WY	Flaming Gorge Unit																							
UT	Weber River																							
UT	Provo River																							

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

GRAZING LEA  
U.S. DEPARTM  
FORMATION  
INTERIOR

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUH's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
---------------------------	-------	-----------------	--------------	--------	---------	---------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------	-----------------------	---------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	---	--

Bureau of Reclamation

Pacific Northwest  
Region

Columbia Basin	WA	63,834	127
Okanogan		380	2
Yakima		3,518	8

--See Pacific Northwest Region, Idaho--

Upper Colorado  
Region

Eden	WY	29,007	2
Seedskadee		632	2

--See Upper Colorado Region, Pine River, Colorado--

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:		
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	\$	Yes	No	Rebate Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher
<b>Bureau of Reclamation</b>																			
	Pacific Northwest Region	-No Record-			100		No Record			X	No Record			X	X	X	X	X	X
WA	Columbia Basin																		
WA	Okanogan																		
WA	Yakima																		
	Upper Colorado Region	X			100		None			X	X	X	X	X				X	
WY	Eden																		
WY	Seedskadee																		

\*For Tenure Rights:  
 A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUM's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
<b>National Park Service</b>																
Grand Canyon N.P.	AZ	43,240	1,541	7	6	BLM	1	No	2.31/AUM	5	No	No	No Record	5,177	4,000	Yes
Glen Canyon N.R.A.	AZ/UT	891,632	14,371	38	No Record	BLM	1	No	2.31/AUM	10	No	No	No Record	33,197	No Record	No
Pt. Reyes National Sea- shore Golden Gate N.S.	CA	16,735	29,261	39	25	Private Rates	1	No	5.00/AUM	5	No	No	No Record	72,549	0	Yes
Black Canyon of the Gun- nison N.M.	CO	100	100	1	1	BLM	10	No	2.31/AUM	10	No	No	No Record	230	0	No
Curecanti N.R.A.		300	1,000	1	1	BLM	1	No	2.31/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	1,890	0	No
Dinosaur N.M.		132,550	5,324	22	20	BLM	1	No	2.31/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	7,700	0	No
Florissant Fossil Beds N.M.		200	110	1	1	BLM	Not Done	No	.32/AUM <sup>1</sup>	4	No	No	No Record	35	0	Yes
Nez Perce N.H.P.	ID	1,122	236	2	3	BLM	1	No	2.31/AUM	1 or 3	No	No	No Record	545	0	No
Bighorn Canyon N.R.A.	MT	16,086	4,225	No Record	No Record	BLM	No Record	No Record	2.31/AUM	--No Record--				8,381	No Record	No Record

<sup>1</sup> Not adjusted to annual BLM rate since originally set.

Grazing Lease Information

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:		
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both
<u>National Park Service</u>																			
AZ	Grand Canyon N.P.	X			100		4,000			X				X	X			X	
AZ/UT	Glen Canyon N.R.A.									Not Applicable - BLM Administers									
CA	Pt. Reyes National Seashore Golden Gate N.S.	X			100		0			X				X					X
CO	Black Canyon of the Gunnison N.M.	X			100		0			X				X					X
CO	Curecanti N.R.A.	X			100		0			X				X				X	
CO	Dinosaur N.M.	X		50	50		0			X				X				X	
CO	Florissant Fossil Beds N.M.	X		25	75		0			X				X	X			X	
ID	Nez Perce N.H.P.	X			100		0			X				X				X	
MT	Bighorn Canyon N.R.A.									Not Applicable - BLM Administers									

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

GRAZING LEASING INFORMATION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUM's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consid- ered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)	
<u>National Park Service</u>																	
Grant-Kohrs N.H.S.	MT		--No Record--			BLM		No Record	No Record	BLM Rate		--No Record--		No Record	No Record	No Record	
Lake Mead N.R.A.	NV/AZ	296,666	11,394	No Record	No Record	BLM		No Record	No	2.31/AUM	No Record	No	No Record	26,320	0	No Record	
John Day Fossil Beds	OR	920	126	1	1	BLM		1	No	2.31/AUM	1	No	No	0	291	0	No
Capitol Reef N.P.	UT	177,000	4,779	No Record	No Record	BLM		1	No Record	2.31/AUM		--No Record--		11,039	No Record	No Record	
Coulee Dam N.R.A.	WA	2,049	833	24	23	BLM or USFS		1	No	1.65/AUM	3	No	No	No Record	1,374	0	Yes
Whitman Mission N.H.S.		26	No Record	1	1	Private Rates & Formula		4	Yes	5.77/Ac	1	No	Yes	75	150	0	Yes
Fossil Butte N.M.	WY	200	110	1	1	BLM		Not Done	No	.32/AUM	4	No	No	0	35	0	Yes
Grand Teton N.P.		27,225	8,210	11	11	USFS		1	Yes	2.31/AUM	10	Yes	No	30,000	17,780	6,800	No
John D. Rockefeller, Jr. Mem. Parkway		600	112	1	1	USFS		1	Yes	2.31/AUM	1	No	No	1,000	259	0	No

GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:			
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both
<u>National Park Service</u>																				
MT	Grant-Kohrs N.H.S.																			
IV/AZ	Lake Head N.R.A.																			
OR	John Day Fossil Beds																			
UT	Capitol Reef N.P.																			
WA	Coulee Dam N.R.A.	X			100		0		X				X			X			X	
WA	Whitman Mission N.H.S.	X			100		0		X		X					X			X	
WY	Fossil Butte N.M.	X																		
WY	Grand Teton N.P.	X	90	10		6,800		X					X			X		X		
WY	John D. Rockefeller, Jr. Memorial Parkway	X			100		0		X				X	X				X		

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acre\$ Grazed	No. AUH's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
<b>U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Service</b>																
Kofa Wildlife Refuge	AZ	187,000	3,000	1	1	BLM	1	No	2.31/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	6,930	0	Yes
Delevan	CA	170	550	1	1	Private Rates	3	No	3.51/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	1,298	No Record	Yes
Kesterson		3,600	3,400 <sup>1</sup>	1	1	Private Rates or Bid	1	No	3.75/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	12,750	No Record	Yes
Hopper Mountain		1,700	1,080	1	1	Private Rates	3	Yes	5.00/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	2,153	None	Yes
Kern		4,450	3,785	1	1	Private Rates	3	Yes	5.00/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	3,096	None	Yes
Pixley		4,075	2,592	4	4	Private Rates	3	Yes	5.00/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	12,450	None	Yes
Clear Lake, Tule Lake																
--See Oregon, Klamath Basin Refuge Complex--																
Hodoc		1,645	1,941	4	4	Private Rates	3	Yes	8.00/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	17,780	No Record	Yes
Alamosa	CO	No Record	3,102	3	3	Private Rates	3	Yes	4.90/AUM	1	No	No	10,000	15,201	No Record	No
Monte Vista		No Record	2,320	1	5	Private Rates	3	Yes	4.90/AUM	15	Yes	No	10,000	11,374	No Record	No

<sup>1</sup>Last grazed in 1980.

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures		Yes	Rebate	Amount	Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:		
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	\$					A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both
<b>U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Service</b>																					
AZ	Kofa Wildlife Refuge	X		20	80		0		X				X				X			X	
CA	Delevan	X			100		0		X				X				X			X	
CA	Kesterson	X			100		0		X				X	X			X			X	
CA	Hopper Mountain	X		100**			0		X				X				X			X	
CA	Kern	X		100**			0		X				X				X			X	
CA	Pixley	X		100**			0		X				X				X			X	
CA	Clear Lake, Tule Lake	X								X										X	
CA	Modoc	X		50	50				X				X	X	X	X	X			X	
CO	Alamosa	X		50**	50	No Record			X				X							X	
CO	Monte Vista	X		50**	50	No Record			X				X							X	

\*For Tenure Rights:  
A - Present tenant has all rights  
B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
D - Other

\*\*Agency maintains external fences; rancher internal fences.

**GRAZING INFORMATION**  
**U.S. DEPT. OF INTERIOR**

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUH's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Considered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
<b>U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Service</b>																
Browns Park	CO	11,174	1,534	2	2	Private Rates, Negotiated	1	No	3.00/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	4,602	None	Yes
Arapaho		8,371	5,782	8	4	Private Rates	1	No	4.00/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	23,128	None	No
S.E. Idaho Complex	ID	9,810	5,730	28	28	Private Rates	3 to 5	Yes		1	No	No	11,000	15,471	No Record	No
Grays Lake									4.00/AUM							
Bear Lake									2.54/AUM							
Camas									2.40/AUM							
Minidoka									1.75/AUM							
Kootenai		115	30	1	1	Private Rates	4	No Record	4.83/AUM	1	No	No	0	145	0	No Record
Quivera	KS	6,600	3,800	12	12	Private Rates	3	Yes	4.00/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	15,276	14,000	No
Charles M. Russell	MT	780,225	60,108	65	87	Private Rates	1	Yes	2.96/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	202,950	6,500	No
Red Rock Lakes		14,600	5,500	9	9	Private Rates	5	Yes	7.03/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	31,300	No Record	Yes

142

Grazing Lease Information  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures		Rebate			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:		
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both	
<b>U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Service</b>																					
CO	Browns Park	X			50	50	0		X			X			X					X	
CO	Arapahoe	X			50	50	0		X			X			X					X	
ID	Southeast Idaho Complex	X			-No Records-		0		X			X			X					X	
	Grays Lake																				
	Bear Lake																				
	Camas																				
	Minidoka																				
ID	Kootenai	X			100		0		X			X			X					X	
KS	Quivera	X			-No Records-		14,000		X			X			X					X	
MT	Charles M. Russell	X			80	20	6,500		X			X							X		X
MT	Red Rock Lakes	X			80	20	No Record		X			X							X		X

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

GRAZING LEASES U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR												INFORMATION OF INTERIOR				
Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUM's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
<b>U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Service</b>																
Medicine Lake	MT	5,800	972	7	6	Private Rates	1	Yes	8.30/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	7,096	0	Yes
Benton Lake		147	30	1	1	Private Rates	1	Yes	4.50/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	173	0	No
Bowdooin (Black Coulee & Credman Coulee)		1,102	195	4	4	Private Rates	1	Yes	.46/Ac	1	No	No	No Record	272	0	Yes
Crescent Lake	NE	19,500	5,100	7	7	Private Rates	1		8.15/AUM	1	No	No	20,000	41,565	5,000	
Fort Niobrara & Valentine		36,304	14,871	16	16	Private Rates	1		8.15/AUM	1	No	No	40,000	121,199	0	No Record
Rainwater Basin		1,294	373	11	11	Private Rates	1		6.15/AUM	<1	No	No	No Record	2,294	0	No Record
Stillwater	NV	163,000	13,000	4	13	Private Rates	3	No	2.50/AUM	1	No	No	4,000	21,411	2,500	Yes
Pahranagat		990	973	1	1	Private Rates	1	No	3.75/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	3,647	0	Yes
Ruby Lake		22,487	5,148	5	4	Private Rates & Negotiated	5	Yes	3.00/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	15,444	No Record	Yes

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures Agency %	Maintenance Expenditures Rancher %	Agency Improvement Expenditures \$	Rebate Yes	Rebate No	Rebate Amount	Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By: Agency	Season of Use Determined By: Rancher	Length of Use Determined By: Both	
		Yes	No	Amount							A	B	C	D				
<b>U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Service</b>																		
MT	Medicine Lake	X		80	20		0		X			X				X		X
MT	Benton Lake	X		80	20		0		X			X				X		X
MT	Bowdoin (Black Coulee & Credman Coulee)	X		80	20		0		X			X				X		X
NE	Crescent Lake	X		50	50		5,000		X		-No Record-				X		X	
NE	Fort Niobrara & Valentine	X		50	50		0		X		-No Record-				X		X	
NE	Rainwater Basin	X			100		0		X		-No Record-				X		X	
NV	Stillwater	X		75	25		2,500		X			X			X		X	
NV	Pahranagat	X		25	75		0		X		X	X			X		X	
NV	Ruby Lake	X		50	50		70%		X			X			X		X	

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

GRAZING LEASING INFORMATION U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR																
Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUM's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs \$	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
<b>U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Service</b>																
Las Vegas	NM	7,700	475	1	1	Bid	1	Yes	10.31/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	1,298	3,600	Yes
Arrowwood	ND	1,730	828	10	10	Formula	1	No	6.50/AUM	2 to 5 Months	Yes	No	0	5,328	0	Yes
Upper Souris		5,470	4,100	16	16	Formula	4	Yes	6.50/AUM	4	No	No	4,000	26,653	0	Yes
J. Clark Sayler						--Unable to Contact--										
Lostwood						--Unable to Contact--										
Audubon		672	280	2	2	Private Rates & Formula	1	No Record	6.50/AUM	1	No	No	900	1,820	No Record	Yes
Des Lacs		1,015	989	5	5	Formula	1	Yes	6.50/AUM	3	Yes	No	No Record	6,422	0	Yes
Kulm Waterfowl Mgt. District	ND	5,313	5,300	51	51	Formula, Private Rates	1	Yes	5.50/AUM	1	No	Yes	No Record	21,279	47,000	Yes
Salt Plains	OK	3,364	2,708	11	9	Private Rates	3	No	4.00/AUM	6 Months	No	No	No Record	10,832	No Record	Yes
Klamath Forest	OR					-- See Klamath Basin Refuge Complex --										
Malheur		52,000	42,056	35	35	Private Rates	3		9.30/AUM Sp & S) 3.70/AUM (F & W)	1 2 4	Yes	No	10,000	157,472	12,000	Yes

GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
 U.S. DEPA      OF INTERIOR

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures		Yes	Rebate	Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:		
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency %	Rancher %	\$				A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both
<b>U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Service</b>																				
NM	Las Vegas		X		100			0	X		3,600		X		X			X		
ND	Arrowwood		X		100			0		X		-No Record-			X			X		
ND	Upper Souris		X		50	50				X				X	X			X		
ND	J. Clark Saylor		X		50	50				X				X	X			X		
ND	Lostwood																			
ND	Audubon		X		50	50		0		X		-No Record-			X			X		
ND	Des Lacs		X		75	25		0		X				X	X			X		
ND	Kulm Waterfowl Mgt. District		X		80	20		47,000	X		No Record	X	X	X	X					
OK	Salt Plains		X		10	90	No Record			X				X	X			X		
OR	Klamath Forest				-- See Klamath Basin Refuge Complex --															
OR	Malheur		X		80	20		12,000		X				X	X			X		

\*For Tenure Rights:  
 A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR**

Agency/Region/ Project	State	Acres Grazed	No. AUM's	Leases	Lessees	Fee Determi- nation	Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)	Other Factors Consi- dered	Typical Fee and Basis \$	Lease Term	Term Varia- ble	Lessee Other Rights	Opera- tion Costs	Total Grazing Income \$	Range Improve- ment Expen- diture	Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)
<b>U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Service</b>																
Sheldon-Hart Mountain	OR/ NV	575,000	33,009	10	5	Private Rates	3	No	1.94/AUM	1	No	No	15,000	116,807	40,000	Yes
Umatilla		1,700	3,073	9	9	Private Rates	3	No	3.25/AUM	1		No	No		10,000	Yes
W.L. Finley		727	680	2	2	Private Rates	3	No	3.83/AUM	1		No	0	1,700	0	Yes
Klamath Basin Refuge Complex		20,500	9,843	11	11	Bid, Negotiated	3	No		1	No	No	No Record	58,500	No Record	Yes
<b>Klamath Forest</b>																
Upper Klamath																
Lower Klamath	OR/ CA								6.00/AUM							
Lacreek	SD	3,500	3,100	9	9	Formula	1	No	8.36/AUM	1	No	No	No Record	25,916	0	Yes
Sand Lake		350	425	4	4	Formula	1	No	8.50/AUM	1 Month	Yes	No	150	3,612	0	Yes
Waubay		1,300	1,342	28	28	Private Rates	3	No	9.05/AUM	1.5 Months	Yes	No	0	7,883	0	Yes
Lake Andes		1,500	1,500	20	20	Private Rates	3	No	8.05/AUM	1	No	No	10,700	12,075	18,287	Yes

FEB 21 1984  
DR. THIEBOLD  
USFS/BLM/DOE/DOJ

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures Agency %	Maintenance Expenditures Rancher %	Agency Improvement Expenditures \$	Rebate Yes	Rebate No	Rebate Amount	Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:		
		Yes	No	Amount							A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both
<b>U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Service</b>																				
OR/ NV	Sheldon- Hart Mountain	X			50	50	30,000 10,000		X						X	X			X	
OR	Umatilla	X			100		10,000		X						X	X			X	
OR	William L. Findley	X			50	50	0		X						X	X			X	
OR	Klamath Basin Refuge Complex																			
	Klamath Forest																			
	Upper Klamath	X			50	50			X						X	X			X	
	Lower Klamath	X			50	50			X						X	X			X	
SD	Lacreek	X			100		0	X		3,100					X	X			X	
SD	Sand Lake	X			70	30	0		X						X	X			X	
SD	Waubay	X			100		0	X		4,262					X	X			X	
SD	Lake Andes	X			60	40	8,287		X						X	X			X	

\*For Tenure Rights:  
A - Present tenant has all rights  
B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
D - Other

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

<u>Agency/Region/ Project</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Acres Grazed</u>	<u>No. AUM's</u>	<u>Leases</u>	<u>Lessees</u>	<u>Fee Determi- nation</u>	<u>Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)</u>	<u>Other Factors Consi- dered</u>	<u>Typical Fee and Basis \$</u>	<u>Lease Term</u>	<u>Term Varia- ble</u>	<u>Lessee Other Rights</u>	<u>Opera- tion Costs \$</u>	<u>Total Grazing Income \$</u>	<u>Range Improve- ment Expen- diture</u>	<u>Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)</u>
<b>U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Service</b>																
Madison Waterfowl Mgt. District	SD	1,582	2,114	24	24	Private Rates	1	No	9.05/AUM	<1	No	No	300	19,132	7,576	Yes
Lower Columbia River Complex	WA	3,100	12,570	10	10	Private Rates	3	No	2.50/AUM	1	No	No	6,000	31,425	0	Yes
<b>Ridgefield</b>																
<b>Willapa</b>																
<b>Columbia White Tailed Deer</b>																
Columbia		5,887	400	5	5	Private Rates	3	No	5.25/AUM	1	No	No	2,000	4,914	6,000	Yes
Turnbull		11,000	2,125	13	12	Private Rates	3	No	3.85/AUM	1	No	No	4,000	81,812	0	Yes

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Grazing Lease Information

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees Retained			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:		
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency	Rancher	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

SD	Madison Waterfowl Mgt. District	X	60	40	4,800	X	No Record			X	X			X
----	---------------------------------	---	----	----	-------	---	-----------	--	--	---	---	--	--	---

WA	Lower Columbia River Complex	X	50	50	0	X				X	X			X
----	------------------------------	---	----	----	---	---	--	--	--	---	---	--	--	---

Ridgefield

Willapa

Columbia White Tailed Deer

WA	Columbia	X	60	40	6,000	X				X	X			X
----	----------	---	----	----	-------	---	--	--	--	---	---	--	--	---

WA	Turnbull	X	50	50	0	X				X	X			X
----	----------	---	----	----	---	---	--	--	--	---	---	--	--	---

\*For Tenure Rights:  
 A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

\*For Tenure Rights:  
 A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

**GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION**  
**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

<u>Agency/Region/ Project</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Acres Grazed</u>	<u>No. AUM's</u>	<u>Leases</u>	<u>Lessees</u>	<u>Fee Determi- nation</u>	<u>Fre- quency of fee Adjust- ment (Yrs.)</u>	<u>Other Factors Consi- dered</u>	<u>Typical Fee and Basis \$</u>	<u>Lease Term</u>	<u>Term Varia- ble</u>	<u>Lessee Other Rights</u>	<u>Opera- tion Costs \$</u>	<u>Total Grazing Income \$</u>	<u>Range Improve- ment Expen- diture</u>	<u>Policy Changes Since 1972 (Yes/No)</u>
<u>U.S. Coast Guard</u>																
12th Coast Guard District	CA	255	No Record	3	3	Private Rates	5	No	22.50/Acre	5	No	No	No Record	5,043	0	No

GRAZING LEASE INFORMATION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

State	Agency/Region/Project	Grazing Fees			Maintenance Expenditures		Agency Improvement Expenditures			Rebate			Tenure Rights*				Season of Use Determined By:			Length of Use Determined By:		
		Yes	No	Amount	Agency	Rancher	%	Expenditures	\$	Yes	No	Amount	A	B	C	D	Agency	Rancher	Both	Agency	Rancher	Both
CA	U.S. Coast Guard District	X		100			0			X			X			X			X			X

\*For Tenure Rights: A - Present tenant has all rights  
 B - Present tenant has first right of refusal  
 C - Present tenant competes on an equal basis  
 D - Other

LITERATURE CITED

Johnston, J., Econometric Methods, 2nd Ed., McGraw-Hill, 1972, p. 214-221.



GRAZING LEASING ARRANGEMENTS AND USER CHARGES SURVEY

Please complete the following questions to the best of your knowledge. Response to this survey is voluntary and not required by law. However, your cooperation is very important to ensure timely and accurate information.

I. GENERAL

1. Name and Location:

A. Agency Name \_\_\_\_\_

B. Agency Telephone Number \_\_\_\_\_  
Area Code \_\_\_\_\_ Number \_\_\_\_\_

C. Address \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip Code \_\_\_\_\_

D. Please indicate government agency type  
 Federal  State  Local

E. Name of Contact Person \_\_\_\_\_  
First Initial \_\_\_\_\_ Last \_\_\_\_\_

F. Telephone Number of Contact Person \_\_\_\_\_  
Area Code \_\_\_\_\_ Number \_\_\_\_\_

2. Grazing statistics:

A. Total acres leased for grazing \_\_\_\_\_

B. Number of leased acres that are irrigated \_\_\_\_\_

C. Number of AUM's \_\_\_\_\_ AUM's are Animal Unit Months

D. How many acres that you wish to lease could not be leased under the current lease arrangement and charges? \_\_\_\_\_ acres

3. Lease statistics:

A. Number of separate leases \_\_\_\_\_

B. Number of separate leasees \_\_\_\_\_

C. Size of leases, \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_  
Minimum acres \_\_\_\_\_ Maximum acres \_\_\_\_\_

## II. FEE DETERMINATION

\*\*\*\*\*

1. What general method(s) best describe how your grazing fee is determined? (Mark all that apply)

- A. sealed bid
- B. auction
- C. set by a board or committee
- D. based upon private lease rates in local area
- E. negotiated between agency and rancher
- F. set by a formula
- G. set by BLM or Forest Service Fees

2. If grazing fees are arranged several different ways, please answer the following questions:

- A. List the factors in order of importance which determine which method is used.

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_

- B. What amount of the total grazing leased and amount of grazing fee revenue stem from each fee arrangement?

Fee Arrangement (Use letters A-F from question II-1)	Total Grazing (Acres)	Total Fee Revenue (S)
1. _____	_____	_____
2. _____	_____	_____
3. _____	_____	_____
4. _____	_____	_____

3. How often is a new grazing fee set? \_\_\_\_\_ years

4. Is obtaining a fair market price the primary objective in setting the fee rate?

Yes       No

5. If there are other factors considered in setting the fee, please indicate: (Mark all that apply)

- A. ability of ranchers to pay
- B. encourage the grazing of livestock
- C. encourage local economies
- D. other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\*  
6. FOR EACH DIFFERENT METHOD OF FEE DETERMINATION (SEE QUESTION II-1)  
USED BY YOUR AGENCY COMPLETE ONLY THE APPROPRIATE SECTIONS A-F BELOW  
\*\*\*\*\*

A. OR B. SEALED BID OR AUCTION

1. Time(s) of year bids are let \_\_\_\_\_
2. Average number of auctions per year \_\_\_\_\_
3. Average number of participants \_\_\_\_\_
4. Distribution of winning bids:  
Range: \$ \_\_\_\_\_      \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
                Low bid      High bid

5. Show the typical fee rate and basis upon which it is charged:

- \_\_\_\_ 1) \$ per AUM
- \_\_\_\_ 2) \$ per acre
- \_\_\_\_ 3) \$ per pound of livestock gain
- \_\_\_\_ 4) \$ per cow-calf pair
- \_\_\_\_ 5) \$ per head
- \_\_\_\_ 6) fixed yearly fee of \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 7) other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

6. Are any other items of value covered by the assessed fee?

- \_\_\_\_ 1) crops
- \_\_\_\_ 2) use of facilities
- \_\_\_\_ 3) water rights
- \_\_\_\_ 4) mineral rights
- \_\_\_\_ 5) other, specify all \_\_\_\_\_

7. What would the estimated fee be without any of the items listed in #6?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ per \_\_\_\_\_

C. BOARD OR COMMITTEE SETTING OF FEE:

1. Is this the board's single most important function? \_\_\_\_\_
2. List factors in order of importance that are considered in setting the fee:
  - a. \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. \_\_\_\_\_
3. Show the fee rate and basis upon which it is charged:
  - 1) \$ per AUM \_\_\_\_\_
  - 2) \$ per acre \_\_\_\_\_
  - 3) \$ per pound of livestock gain \_\_\_\_\_
  - 4) \$ per cow-calf pair \_\_\_\_\_
  - 5) \$ per head \_\_\_\_\_
  - 6) fixed yearly fee of \$ \_\_\_\_\_
  - 7) other, specify \_\_\_\_\_
4. Are any other items of value covered by the assessed fee?
  - 1) crops \_\_\_\_\_
  - 2) use of facilities \_\_\_\_\_
  - 3) water rights \_\_\_\_\_
  - 4) mineral rights \_\_\_\_\_
  - 5) other, specify all \_\_\_\_\_
5. What would the estimated fee be without any of the items listed in #4?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ per \_\_\_\_\_
6. If a fee system is variable (varies among leases or individuals, etc.), list the factors that change the fee and by how much:

Factors	Amount \$	%
a. _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
b. _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
c. _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
d. _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

D. COMPARISON WITH PRIVATE LEASE RATES:

1. How is the comparable private lease rate ascertained?

2. List the factors in order of importance that are used to adjust the private lease rate to arrive at your agency's fee:

- a. \_\_\_\_\_
- b. \_\_\_\_\_
- c. \_\_\_\_\_
- d. \_\_\_\_\_

3. How often are private leases monitored to update the fee?

4. Show the typical fee rate and basis upon which it is charged:

- \_\_\_\_ 1) \$ per AUM
- \_\_\_\_ 2) \$ per acre
- \_\_\_\_ 3) \$ per pound of livestock gain
- \_\_\_\_ 4) \$ per cow-calf pair
- \_\_\_\_ 5) \$ per head
- \_\_\_\_ 6) fixed yearly fee of \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 7) other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

5. Are any other items of value covered by the assessed fee?

- \_\_\_\_ 1) crops
- \_\_\_\_ 2) use of facilities
- \_\_\_\_ 3) water rights
- \_\_\_\_ 4) mineral rights
- \_\_\_\_ 5) other, specify all \_\_\_\_\_

6. What would the estimated fee be without any of the items listed in #5?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ per \_\_\_\_\_

7. If a fee system is variable (varies among leases or individuals, etc.), list the factors that change the fee and by how much:

Factors	Amount \$	%
a. _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
b. _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
c. _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
d. _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

E. NEGOTIATION WITH THE RANCHER:

1. List the factors in order of importance that are considered during the renegotiation:

\_\_\_\_\_

2. Does the current renter have any fee rights upon renegotiation:

\_\_\_\_\_

3. Show the typical fee rate and basis upon which it is charged:

- 1) \$ per AUM
- 2) \$ per acre
- 3) \$ per pound of livestock gain
- 4) \$ per cow-calf pair
- 5) \$ per head
- 6) fixed yearly fee of \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- 7) other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

4. Are any other items of value covered by the assessed fee?

- 1) crops
- 2) use of facilities
- 3) water rights
- 4) mineral rights
- 5) other, specify all \_\_\_\_\_

5. What would the estimated fee be without any of the items listed in #4?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ per \_\_\_\_\_

6. If a fee system is variable (varies among leases or individuals, etc.), list the factors that change the fee and by how much:

Factors	Amount \$	%
a. _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
b. _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
c. _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
d. _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

F. SET BY A FORMULA:

1. What is the exact formula? \_\_\_\_\_

2. How was this formula derived? \_\_\_\_\_

3. How is the base rate determined? \_\_\_\_\_

4. Where and how are variables that update the formula determined?

5. What is the formula supposed to accomplish? \_\_\_\_\_

6. Show the typical fee rate and basis upon which it is charged:

1) \$ per AUM

2) \$ per acre

3) \$ per pound of livestock gain

4) \$ per cow-calf pair

5) \$ per head

6) fixed yearly fee of \$ \_\_\_\_\_

7) other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

7. Are any other items of value covered by the assessed fee?

1) crops

2) use of facilities

3) water rights

4) mineral rights

5) other, specify all \_\_\_\_\_

8. What would the estimated fee be without any of the items listed in #7?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ per \_\_\_\_\_

9. If a fee system is variable (varies among leases or individuals, etc.), list the factors that change the fee and by how much:

	Factors	Amount \$	±
a.	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
b.	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
c.	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
d.	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____

III. LEASE RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS: (This section is to be completed for each fee system - see A-F in question II-1 your agency uses.)

\*\*\*\*\*

1. The number of years of lease duration is \_\_\_\_\_
2. If the lease length is variable, list the factors which determine duration:
  - A. \_\_\_\_\_
  - B. \_\_\_\_\_
  - C. \_\_\_\_\_
3. Does your agency set any requirements to qualify for a grazing lease? (Mark all that apply)
  - A. commensurate property
  - B. residency
  - C. prior use
  - D. type of livestock. (explain) \_\_\_\_\_
  - E. other, (describe) \_\_\_\_\_
4. Is there any limit as to the amount of grazing any one person can lease?  Yes  No If so, how much? \_\_\_\_\_
5. How is renewal of the lease determined? (Mark all that apply)
  - A. the present tenant has all rights
  - B. the present tenant has first right of refusal
  - C. the present tenant competes on an equal basis
  - D. other, specify \_\_\_\_\_
6. What are the terms of payment? (Mark all that apply)
  - A. full payment in advance for term of lease
  - B. annual payment at the end of grazing season
  - C. payment at beginning of grazing season
  - D. annual payment on lease anniversary
  - E. monthly payment
  - F. other (explain) \_\_\_\_\_
7. In the lease does the agency or the rancher set the following items? (Mark all items A - D)

	Agency	Rancher	Both
A. season of use	_____	_____	_____
B. number of livestock/acre	_____	_____	_____
C. length of use	_____	_____	_____
D. location of livestock	_____	_____	_____
E. Sub-leasing	_____	_____	_____
F. Ownership of livestock	_____	_____	_____
G. Breeds or quality of lvstk	_____	_____	_____
H. Livestock management	_____	_____	_____
J. OTHER (specify)	_____	_____	_____

3. A. Does the grazing tenant in the lease have the right to:  
(Mark all that apply)

- 1. control hunting or fishing
- 2. control all access
- 3. control vehicle access
- 4. control wildlife
- 5. use other resources, e.g., timber water, etc.

B. Does the grazing tenant have the right to charge for any of the  
above items?  Yes  No

9. If the lease is transferred from the present tenant to another, how  
are range improvements that have been financed by the present tenant  
exchanged? (Mark all that apply)

- A. The present tenant is compensated by the agency
- B. The present tenant is compensated by the new tenant
- C. The present tenant is compensated by the agency and new tenant
- D. No compensation is made
- E. Moveable improvements are allowed to be removed
- F. Nonmoveable improvements are required to be removed

10. For the following categories of costs the agency or rancher assumes  
what proportion?

<u>Category</u>	<u>Agency Percentage</u>	<u>Rancher Percentage</u>
A. Salting, minerals, supplemental feed	_____	_____
B. Herding or livestock management	_____	_____
C. Maintenance	_____	_____
water facilities	_____	_____
fence	_____	_____
other, specify _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
D. Transportation of livestock	_____	_____
E. Veterinary	_____	_____
F. Other, specify _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

11. Of the above items (in question 11), which ones are set by the lease  
system and/or fee systems?

	<u>Lease set</u>	<u>Fee set</u>
A.	_____	_____
B.	_____	_____
C.	_____	_____
D.	_____	_____
E.	_____	_____
F. Other	_____	_____
1.	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____

IV. EXPENDITURES AND RECEIPTS OF GRAZING FEES

\*\*\*\*\*

1. The total amount of grazing fees collected by your agency last year was?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

2. What is the amount of the grazing revenues retained by your land administration agency for its use? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

3. If part of the grazing fees are not retained by the agency, describe how they are distributed. \_\_\_\_\_

4. Is there a fixed proportion of the grazing fees collected that is distributed to:

(\$ or %)

A. Range or grazing division \_\_\_\_\_

B. Field supervision or oversight \_\_\_\_\_

C. Range improvements \_\_\_\_\_

D. Other range or grazing programs, specify \_\_\_\_\_

5. If funds from other sources are used to administer the grazing or range program, please answer the following:

A. What is the source of those funds and the amount?

Source Amount (\$)

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_

B. Are the funds a steady flow:  Yes  No OR meant to  
fill in as needed when grazing fees are not adequate?  Yes  No

C. Are these funds earmarked for any special program?

Program Amount (\$) or %

1. Range or grazing division \_\_\_\_\_
2. Field supervision or oversight \_\_\_\_\_
3. Range improvements \_\_\_\_\_
4. Other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

V. RANGE IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURES (EXCLUDES MAINTENANCE OR COSTS OF GRAZING)

\*\*\*\*\*

1. How much expenditure was made last year for range improvements?

	Dollars	% by Landlord
A. Fencing	_____	_____
B. Water development	_____	_____
C. Soil-vegetation improvement	_____	_____
D. Other, specify _____	_____	_____

2. How much rebate or discount on fees was given  
improvement expenditures? \_\_\_\_\_

3. When permanent improvements are installed:

- A. Who has legal ownership of the movable (improvement) facilities  
(e.g., tanks)?  Tenant  Landlord
- B. Who has legal ownership of non-movable improvements (e.g., spraying)?  
 Tenant  Landlord
- C. How is the resulting increase in carrying capacity allocated?  
 Tenant  Landlord

4. Are lease terms altered if the tenant participates in improvement cost:

- A. Can lease be terminated before useful life of improvement expires?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- B. Does compensation have to be made to tenant if lease is terminated?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- C. In what way are lease contracts rewritten?  
\_\_\_\_\_

VI. POLICY CHANGES

\*\*\*\*\*

1. Has your agency altered its grazing policy since 1970?  No  Yes  
If yes, please indicate policy changes and the year of change.

Policy Change	Year of Change		
	19__	19__	19__
A. Fee determination			
1. method of fee determination			
2. variable fee system			
3. items included			
4. rate basis			
5. other			
B. Lease policy			
1. duration of lease			
2. qualification for lease			
3. limits of acreage amount			
4. renewal rights			
5. lease management			
6. other use management			
7. range improvement transfer			
8. lease terms			
9. other			
C. Expenditures and receipts			
1. percentage retained			
2. distribution of non-retained fees			
3. distribution of retained fees			
4. sources of non-fee funds			
5. other			
D. Range improvements			
1. amounts of range improvement			
2. rebate or discounts on policy			
3. ownership of improvements			
4. lease terms and improvements			
5. other			
E. Costs of grazing			
1. proportion of cost-sharing			
2. fee or lease terms and costs			
3. other			

2. What was the reason for the policy change?

- A. Reason for fee policy change \_\_\_\_\_
- B. Reason for lease policy change \_\_\_\_\_
- C. Reason for expenditure and receipt policy change \_\_\_\_\_
- D. Reason for range improvements policy change \_\_\_\_\_
- E. Reason for costs of grazing policy change \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX D

Grazing Fee Formulas Used by State Land Agencies

This appendix contains a summary of each formula that is used by state land agencies. The formulas and factors used in the formulas are described.

Fees charged during 1981 are reported herein. Fees are in a constant state of flux from year to year. For example, the fee reported for the Idaho Department of State Lands is the highest fee ever charged by that department. To maintain consistency, fees reported here are fees charged during the calendar or fiscal year of 1981.

#### ARIZONA

Prior to 1982, the formula was based on 22% (required by statute) of the value of a hundred weight average price of beef from the previous year. In 1981, the average per cut of beef in 1980 was \$63.642.

$$\text{Grazing Fee per A.U.} = .22 \times \$63.642 = \$14.00124 \\ \text{This equates to } \$1.17 \text{ per AUM.}$$

The formula was revised April 22, 1982 and is similar to the PRIA formula. The difference is that the Base Fee (\$1.23) is reduced by \$0.28 for range improvement investment and tax paid on improvement by grazing lessees on state land.

$$\text{Grazing Fee per AUM} = (\text{Base Fee} - .28) \times \frac{(\text{BPI} + \text{FVI} - \text{PPI})}{100}$$

where:  
BPI = Beef Price Index  
FVI = Forage Value Index  
PPI = Prices Paid Index

For the period 7/10/82 to 6/30/83, the rate per AUM was

$$(\$1.23 - .28) \left( \frac{268 + 242 - 359}{100} \right) = \$1.4345/\text{AUM}$$

#### COLORADO

Colorado State Land Board has been examining the possibility of using a formula, but the Board has set the grazing fee through 1982. Factors that are considered are current private lease rates, revenue needs of the state, and current economic conditions of the rancher as reflected by beef prices. Private lease rates are appraised every 3 years. The grazing fee is equal to the base rate as determined by the Board, plus an application fee (\$0.75 per 160 acres). A new fee is set every 3 years.

#### MONTANA

Montana Department of State Lands uses a formula to set a minimum bid to be used in sealed bidding for grazing. The formula was changed in 1979, and is based on the average beef price of the previous year as

reported by Montana's Livestock Statistical Report.

Grazing Fee per AUM - 6 x Average Beef Price per lb

The fee in 1981 was \$3.47 per AUM

#### NEW MEXICO

The Surface Division of the Commission of Public Lands administers grazing in New Mexico. The Commissioner working with the legislature establishes a base rate which was established until 1971 at \$6.40/AU. From 1971 through 1975 this was increased 20% per year. In 1976, the rate was two times the 1971 rate (\$12.80/AU). In 1981, the rate was set at three times the 1971 rate (\$19.20/AU or \$1.60/AUM). A formula is used to determine dollar charge per acre based on carrying capability in AU's per section.

#### OKLAHOMA

Through 1982, Commissioner of the Land Office used a formula base on a variable market method. The fee is based on the value of the commodity that the forage produces, but can be adjusted by the Commissioner.

Grazing Fee for one cow per year =  $\frac{1}{3}(450 \text{ lb calf}) \times (\text{cwt Calf Price})$   
The calf price is determined by a weighted monthly average of 500 lb and under calves as reported by the Oklahoma Crop Reporting Service.

#### SOUTH DAKOTA

South Dakota Department of Schools and Public Lands uses a formula to set minimum bids and this is adjusted annually.

$$\text{Grazing fee per AUM} = \frac{20\% \text{ (5 yr-average prive of } 425 \text{ lb calf)}(425)}{12 \text{ months}}$$

The 20% factor has been modified. In 1979, 1980 and 1981, 25% was used instead of 20%. In 1978, the statutory formula would have made the fee \$2.94/AUM, but the Commissioner established \$4.00/AUM. In 1982, a 23% factor was used.

1981 rate:  $\frac{25\% (.6205)(425)}{12} = \$5.49/\text{AUM}$

1982 rate:  $\frac{23\% (.6824)(425)}{12} = \$5.56/\text{AUM}$

#### WASHINGTON

The Department of Natural Resources uses a formula to determine minimum bids for public auctions. The formula is based on the amount of beef that is the state's share per AUM. This is based on the average monthly gain (50 lbs) on livestock on range, the average stockman's investment assigned to land (40%) and the landlord's fair share of income (30%).

$$50 \text{ lbs} \times 40\% \times 30\% = 6 \text{ lbs or the state's share per AUM}$$

A weighted beef price is calculated based on the previous year's prices of calves, steers, and heifers, and cows as reported by the USDA Statistical Reporting Service.

$$\text{Grazing Fee per AUM} = (\text{weighted beef price per pound}) \times 6 \text{ lbs}$$

#### WYOMING

The Wyoming State Land Board uses a formula which sets the upper and lower limits that it can charge for leasing state lands. The minimum is 2% of the appraised rental value and the maximum is 5½%. Currently the aggregate land value to support one Animal Unit for 12 months is set at \$600. Current rate of the appraised rental value is 3.33%.

$$\text{Grazing Fee per AUM} = \frac{\$600 \times 3.33\%}{12} = \$1.665$$

Formulae for individual leases that are used are:

A. Acres per AUM x 12 mos = Acres per AU

$$\frac{\$600 \text{ Base per AU}}{\text{Acres per AU}} = \text{Value per Acre}$$

B. Value per Acre x % of Appraised Value = charge per Acre

$$\text{Charge per Acre} \times \text{Acres per AUM} = \text{charge per AUM}$$

## OTHER STATES

The land board or commission determines the grazing fees in Idaho, Nebraska, Oregon, and Utah. California uses PRIA, negotiation, and competitive bids depending on the lease. North Dakota uses public auctions. Neither Kansas nor Nevada have state lands.

## APPENDIX E

## GRAZING FEE STATISTICS SUMMARIZED BY

## TYPE OF GOVERNMENT

Federal Agencies are sorted by the type of government (local, state, or federal).

The SPSS software package on the Colorado State University computer was used to compute the statistics displayed. Variables broken out by government type include: total acres, total revenue, Animal Unit Months (AUM) AUM's per acre, dollar receipts per AUM, dollar receipts per acre, the number of leases, the number of lessees, lease duration, improvement expenditures, irrigated acres, and responses to questions regarding whether or not the free market value of grazing was a determinant of the fee charged.

Note that total and mean values displayed are totals and means of values reported by responding agencies; agencies not surveyed or which did not respond are obviously not included. Since our survey did not include every agency and not every agency surveyed responded to every question, the totals displayed must not be interpreted as complete sums of measured variables by government type. Statistics displayed in this appendix are totals and means of values reported by responding agencies ONLY.

APPENDIX E

FOOTNOTES:

1. Dollar values are values reported by agencies. Values are not total values divided by units of grazing unless the agency indicated that it used this division.
2. Free market values as reported here is the percent of agencies reporting that "obtaining a fair market price" was "the primary objective in setting the fee rate." See question II - 4 of the Questionnaire in Appendix C.
3. Non-free market proxies is a frequency distribution of yes-no responses to question II-5 of the Questionnaire (Appendix C)

TABLE E1

TOTAL ACRES BY GOVERNMENT

TOTAL REVENUE BY GOVERNMENT

<u>Government</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Federal	11,172,211	64,208.11	241,295.56	174
State	41,118,087	1,174,802.49	2,442,185.39	35
Local	410,966	10,274.15	38,613.82	40
INCLUDED AGENCIES	52,701,263	211,651.66	1,005,607.01	249

TABLE E2  
TOTAL REVENUE BY GOVERNMENT

<u>Government</u>	<u>Total</u>	\$ <u>Mean</u>	\$ <u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Federal	25,575,699	147836.41	798342.17	173
State	19,371,055	605345.47	1146726.16	32
Local	2,152,590	55194.62	159718.58	39
INCLUDED AGENCIES	47,099,344	193030.10	806078.88	244

TABLE E3  
TOTAL AUM's BY GOVERNMENT

<u>Government</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Federal	2,274,609	23,943.25	126,055.01	95
State	3,753,470	163,194.35	337,330.65	23
Local	120,392	10,032.67	14,936.35	12
INCLUDED AGENCIES	7,148,470	54,568.47	201,487.85	131

Footnote 1.

TABLE E4  
AUM/ACRE BY GOVERNMENT

<u>Government</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Federal	20.81	193.36	92
State	.29	.41	23
Local	1.13	1.61	12
INCLUDED AGENCIES	15.24	164.58	127

TABLE E5

\$/AUM BY GOVERNMENT

NUMBER OF LENSES BY GOVERNMENT

<u>Government</u>	<u>\$ Mean</u>	<u>\$ Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Federal	6.66	3.63	127
State	5.28	2.78	31
Local	6.92	5.75	18
INCLUDED AGENCIES	6.44	3.79	176
INCLUDED AGENCIES	52,981	771.42	261

Footnote 1.

TABLE E6

\$/ACRE BY GOVERNMENT

<u>Government</u>	<u>\$ Mean</u>	<u>\$ Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Federal	4.74	8.11	32
State	6.13	6.37	3
Local	11.99	9.98	24
INCLUDED AGENCIES	7.76	9.41	59

Footnote 1

TABLE E9  
MEAN LEASE DURATION (YEARS) BY GOVERNMENT  
NUMBER OF LEASES BY GOVERNMENT

<u>Government</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Federal	18,593	105.64	457.32	176
State	34,087	973.91	1,613.90	35
Local	271	6.78	12.19	40
INCLUDED AGENCIES	52,951	210.96	772.42	251

TABLE E8  
NUMBER OF LESSEES BY GOVERNMENT

<u>Government</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Federal	9,163	54.54	233.43	168
State	20,340	701.38	1,261.37	29
Local	252	6.30	10.56	40
INCLUDED AGENCIES	29,755	125.55	523.54	237

TABLE E9

MEAN LEASE DURATION (YEARS) BY GOVERNMENT

<u>Government</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Federal	3.63	2.33	179
State	5.51	3.69	37
Local	2.90	1.74	39
INCLUDED AGENCIES	3.79	2.60	255

TABLE E10  
IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURES BY GOVERNMENT

<u>Government</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>\$ Mean</u>	<u>\$ Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Federal	573,513	6,909.80	20,672.86	83
State	471,222	18,123.92	39,834.59	26
Local	42,636	1,218.17	4,928.14	35
INCLUDED AGENCIES	1,087,371	7,551.19	23,635.33	144

TABLE E11  
IRRIGATED ACRES BY GOVERNMENT

<u>Government</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Federal	43,911	385.18	2,229.65	114
State	480,289	14,554.21	53,003.50	33
Local	22,597	564.93	2,699.61	40
INCLUDED AGENCIES	546,795	2,924.04	22,738.22	187

TABLE E12  
FREE MARKET VALUE BY GOVERNMENT

<u>Government</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Federal	.83	.37	156
State	.76	.44	37
Local	.61	.50	38
INCLUDED AGENCIES	.73	.41	231

Footnote 2

TABLE E13

NON-FREE MARKET PROXIES BY GOVERNMENT

<u>Government</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Federal	.44	.79	158
State	1.00	1.18	37
Local	.59	.75	39
INCLUDED AGENCIES	.55	.87	234

Footnote 3

APPENDIX F

GRAZING FEE STATISTICS SUMMARIZED BY STATE

Agencies are sorted by state. All surveyed local, state, and federal agencies are included. The SPSS software package on the Colorado State University computer was used to compute the statistics displayed. Variables are broken out by total acres, total revenue, animal unit months (AUM's), AUM's per acre, dollar receipts per AUM, dollar receipts per acre, number of leases, number of lessees, lease durations, improvement expenditures, irrigated acres, and responses to questions regarding whether the free market value of grazing was a determinant of the fee charged.

Note that total and mean values displayed are totals and means of values reported by responding agencies; agencies not surveyed or which did not respond are obviously not included. Since our survey did not include every agency and not every agency surveyed responded to every question, the totals displayed must not be interpreted as complete sums of measured variables. Statistics displayed in this appendix are totals and means of values reported by responding agencies ONLY.

APPENDIX F

FOOTNOTES:

1. Dollar values are values reported by agencies. Values are not total values divided by units of grazing unless the agency indicated that it used this division.
2. Free market values as reported here is the percent of agencies reporting that "obtaining a fair market price" was "the primary objective in getting the fee rate." See question II-4 of the Questionnaire in Appendix C.
3. Non-free market proxies is a frequency distribution of yes-no responses to question II-5 of the QUESTIONNAIRE (Appendix C).

CONDENSED TABLE BY STATE

<u>State</u>	<u>Total Acres</u>	<u>Number of Leases</u>	<u>\$ Per Acre</u>	<u>\$ Per AUM</u>	<u>Total AUM's</u>
Arizona	2,946,065.33 (5,048,038.87)	395.00 (780.01)	9.48 (4.86)	5.99 (6.46)	424,193.67 (732,351.23)
California	14,774.66 (36,148.09)	7.02 (10.94)	11.15 (11.92)	9.21 (4.93)	40,809.45 (178,394.88)
Colorado	167,892.44 (638,958.94)	154.50 (669.79)	5.63 (6.19)	4.92 (1.73)	2,435.17 (2,064.17)
Idaho	221,876.60 (657,148.53)	173.09 (477.75)		6.20 (3.51)	42,998.00 (102,046.74)
Kansas	2,060.50 (4,227.69)	22.94 (73.96)		5.74 (2.80)	3,704.00 (135.76)
Montana	664,750.82 (1,176,312.08)	1,064.15 (1,847.24)	.46 (0)	5.88 (2.40)	64,704.20 (80,823.99)
Nebraska	118,151.18 (370,707.46)	84.91 (265.07)	10.18 (7.70)	8.47 (3.28)	4,185.80 (6,323.45)
Nevada	41,904.70 (51,915.46)	6.25 (10.51)	1.50 (0)	3.04 (1.26)	4,664.40 (4,464.75)
New Mexico	1,146,014.45 (3,280,649.34)	586.73 (1,648.16)	.69 (.53)	4.41 (2.83)	398.57 (376.83)
North Dakota	304,513.50 (734,855.41)	420.70 (845.87)	.98 (0)	6.63 (.25)	173,281.00 (452,744.35)
Oklahoma	41,316.68 (119,413.59)	238.42 (669.35)	8.78 (9.97)	4.98 (2.55)	219,609.33 (372,733.16)
Oregon	118,402.92 (222,800.33)	32.42 (72.70)	1.00 (0)	5.41 (3.24)	15,516.18 (19,805.87)
South Dakota	74,083.67 (242,962.88)	276.67 (883.77)	5.02 (10.28)	7.76 (1.53)	56,710.00 (134,758.65)
Utah	652,675.60 (1,209,999.26)	641.00 (1,239.42)		6.59 (4.17)	79,335.00 (104,178.04)
Washington	111,375.00 (284,624.49)	95.57 (394.32)	13.30 (16.75)	5.28 (2.78)	5,938.30 (7,829.61)
Wyoming	533,316.86 (1,358,987.59)	497.75 (1,374.42)	.33 (0)	7.00 (0)	190,997.80 (414,122.43)
INCLUDED POPULATION	211,651.66 (1,005,607.01)	210.96 (772.42)	7.76 (9.41)	6.44 (3.79)	54,568.47 (201,487.85)

TABLE F1  
TOTAL ACRES BY STATE

<u>State</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Arizona	8,838,195	2,946,065.33	5,048,038.87	3
California	856,930	14,774.66	36,148.09	58
Colorado	3,022,064	167,892.44	638,958.94	18
Idaho	2,218,766	221,876.60	657,148.53	10
Kansas	32,968	2,060.50	4,227.69	16
Montana	7,312,259	664,750.82	1,176,312.08	11
Nebraska	1,299,663	118,151.18	370,707.46	11
Nevada	419,047	41,904.70	51,915.46	10
New Mexico	12,606,159	1,146,014.45	3,280,649.34	11
North Dakota	3,045,135	304,513.50	734,855.91	10
Oklahoma	1,404,767	41,316.68	119,413.59	34
Oregon	1,420,835	118,402.92	222,800.33	12
South Dakota	889,004	74,083.67	242,962.88	12
Utah	3,263,378	652,675.60	1,209,999.26	5
Washington	2,338,875	111,375.00	284,624.49	21
Wyoming	3,733,218	533,316.86	1,358,987.59	7
INCLUDED POPULATION	52,701,263	211,651.66	1,005,607.01	249

TABLE F2

TOTAL REVENUE BY STATE

<u>State</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>\$ Mean</u>	<u>\$ Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Arizona	1,493,271	373,317.75	739,670.73	4
California	3,751,041	66,982.88	142,773.18	56
Colorado	205,830	11,435.00	9,038.78	18
Idaho	984,420	98,442.00	279,941.62	10
Kansas	140,159	9,343.93	27,011.79	15
Montana	11,197,845	933,153.83	1,418,133.11	12
Nebraska	248,623	24,862.30	37,490.81	10
Nevada	114,223	10,383.91	7,101.85	11
New Mexico	3,180,733	318,073.30	946,614.41	10
North Dakota	9,512,258	951,225.80	2,635,528.38	10
Oklahoma	11,158,583	348,705.72	1,146,565.59	32
Oregon	704,598	64,054.36	71,402.24	11
South Dakota	1,513,326	126,110.50	396,568.65	12
Utah	512,317	102,463.40	174,152.20	5
Washington	730,179	34,770.43	76,825.82	21
Wyoming	1,851,937	235,991.00	574,388.15	7
INCLUDED POPULATION	47,099,344	193,030.10	806,078.88	244

TABLE F3  
TOTAL AUM's BY STATE

<u>State</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Arizona	1,272,581	424,193.67	732,351.23	3
California	265,093	40,809.45	178,394.88	31
Colorado	29,222	2,435.17	2,064.17	12
Idaho	300,986	42,998.00	102,046.74	7
Kansas	7,408	3,704.00	135.76	2
Montana	647,042	64,704.20	80,823.99	10
Nebraska	20,925	4,185.80	6,323.45	5
Nevada	46,644	4,664.40	4,464.75	10
New Mexico	2,790	398.57	376.83	7
North Dakota	1,212,967	173,281.00	452,744.35	7
Oklahoma	658,828	219,609.33	372,733.16	3
Oregon	170,678	15,516.18	19,805.87	11
South Dakota	340,260	56,710.00	134,758.65	6
Utah	158,670	79,335.00	104,178.04	2
Washington	59,383	5,938.30	7,829.61	10
Wyoming	954,989	190,997.80	414,122.43	5
INCLUDED POPULATION	6,148,471	47,296.93	184,200.38	130

TABLE F4

AUM/ACRE BY STATE

<u>State</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Arizona	.08	.06	3
California	1.00	1.15	30
Colorado	.72	.97	10
Idaho	.38	.23	6
Kansas	.51	.09	2
Montana	.20	.10	10
Nebraska	.62	.58	5
Nevada	.44	.61	9
New Mexico	.08	.16	7
North Dakota	.61	.32	7
Oklahoma	1.00	.18	3
Oregon	.68	.77	11
South Dakota	.98	.33	6
Utah	.16	.15	2
Washington	.78	1.26	10
Wyoming	.23	.06	5
INCLUDED POPULATION	.63	.83	126

TABLE F5

\$/AUM BY STATE

<u>State</u>	Total	\$ Mean	\$ Standard Deviation	Number of Observations
Arizona	11,651,452	5.99	6.46	2
California	10,535,400	9.21	4.93	44
Colorado	3,070,000	4.92	1.73	9
Idaho	1,034,000	6.20	3.51	7
Kansas	3,367,000	5.74	2.80	16
Montana	13,834,000	5.88	2.40	13
Nebraska	9,934,000	8.47	3.28	5
Nevada	5,500,000	3.04	1.26	10
New Mexico	5,454,000	4.41	2.83	7
North Dakota	4,207,000	6.63	.25	4
Oklahoma	7,068,000	4.98	2.55	23
Oregon	95,000	5.41	3.24	10
South Dakota	2,320,000	7.76	1.53	7
Utah	2,554,000	6.59	4.17	4
Washington	2,044,000	5.28	2.78	14
Wyoming	3,582,000	7.00	3.07	0
INCLUDED POPULATION	10,751,000	6.44	3.79	176

Footnote 1

TABLE F6

\$/ACRE BY STATE

<u>State</u>	\$ <u>Mean</u>	\$ <u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
California	9.48	4.86	11
Colorado	11.15	11.92	6
Idaho	5.63	6.19	2
Montana	.46	0	1
Nebraska	10.18	7.70	6
Nevada	1.50	0	1
New Mexico	.69	.53	3
North Dakota	.98	0	2
Oklahoma	8.78	9.97	11
Oregon	1.00	0	1
South Dakota	5.02	10.28	6
Washington	13.30	16.75	6
Wyoming	.33	0	3
INCLUDED POPULATION	7.76	9.41	59

Footnote 1

TABLE F7  
NUMBER OF LEASES BY STATE

<u>State</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Arizona	1,580	395.00	780.01	4
California	400	7.02	10.94	57
Colorado	3,090	154.50	669.79	20
Idaho	1,904	173.09	477.75	11
Kansas	367	22.94	73.96	16
Montana	13,834	1,064.15	1,847.24	13
Nebraska	934	84.91	265.07	11
Nevada	50	6.25	10.51	8
New Mexico	6,454	586.73	1,648.16	11
North Dakota	4,207	420.70	845.87	10
Oklahoma	7,868	238.42	669.35	33
Oregon	389	32.42	72.70	12
South Dakota	3,320	276.67	883.77	12
Utah	2,564	641.00	1,239.42	4
Washington	2,007	95.57	394.32	21
Wyoming	3,982	497.75	1,374.42	8
INCLUDED POPULATION	52,951	210.96	772.42	251

TABLE F8  
NUMBER OF LESSEES BY STATE

<u>State</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Arizona	1,461	365.25	723.17	4
California	340	6.07	8.98	56
Colorado	2,823	148.58	629.99	19
Idaho	1,279	127.90	376.80	10
Kansas	61	4.07	3.28	15
Montana	3,115	283.18	430.42	11
Nebraska	48	4.80	5.07	10
Nevada	65	8.13	10.64	8
New Mexico	7,694	769.40	1,792.54	10
North Dakota	3,124	312.40	604.26	10
Oklahoma	2,339	83.54	164.91	28
Oregon	375	31.25	72.47	12
South Dakota	1,824	152.00	455.31	12
Utah	2,410	602.50	1,159.78	4
Washington	186	9.30	16.60	20
Wyoming	2,611	326.38	891.74	8
INCLUDED POPULATION	29,755	125.55	523.54	237

TABLE F9

MEAN LEASE DURATION (YEARS) BY STATE

<u>State</u>		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Arizona	50,188,3	5.25	3.69	4
California	76,401,67	3.83	2.15	58
Colorado	157,201,77	4.10	4.08	20
Idaho	09,241	3.73	3.58	11
Kansas	35,706,2	4.50	1.15	16
Montana	35,706,20	3.69	3.88	13
Nebraska	00,100	2.73	2.53	11
Nevada	00,200	1.27	.90	11
New Mexico	00,300,1	4.09	2.70	11
North Dakota	01,400,01	3.00	1.83	10
Oklahoma	02,500,22	4.29	1.31	34
Oregon	03,600,01	3.00	2.93	11
South Dakota	00,700,3	3.00	1.91	12
Utah	04,800,29	5.60	2.61	5
Washington	05,900,11	3.95	2.65	21
Wyoming	06,100,5	5.14	3.63	7
INCLUDED POPULATION	00,200,23	3.79	2.60	255

TABLE F10  
IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURES BY STATE

<u>State</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>\$ Mean</u>	<u>\$ Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Arizona	10,498	3,499.33	6,061.02	3
California	108,758	3,580.32	10,103.51	31
Colorado	68,500	4,566.67	15,409.72	15
Idaho	9	1.29	3.40	7
Kansas	35,506	17,753.00	5,307.54	2
Montana	336,000	33,600.00	45,387.71	10
Nebraska	0	0	0	8
Nevada	4,120	412.00	885.87	10
New Mexico	3,600	400.00	1,200.00	9
North Dakota	43,500	8,700.00	19,453.79	5
Oklahoma	187,036	18,703.60	55,046.20	10
Oregon	30,300	6,060.00	10,833.65	5
South Dakota	7,300	1,825.00	2,307.05	4
Utah	156,850	39,212.50	45,595.84	4
Washington	85,380	6,098.57	17,683.30	14
Wyoming	7,782	1,111.71	2,941.32	7
INCLUDED STATES	1,087,371	7,551.19	23,635.33	144

TABLE F11  
IRRIGATED ACRES BY STATE

<u>State</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Arizona	0	0	0	3
California	19,783	471.02	2,626.49	42
Colorado	159,713	9,394.88	36,256.12	17
Idaho	4,146	376.91	981.01	11
Kansas	0	0	0	3
Montana	26,044	2,003.38	5,881.96	13
Nebraska	100	10.00	31.62	10
Nevada	2,272	252.44	342.32	9
New Mexico	133	12.09	36.91	11
North Dakota	0	0	0	8
Oklahoma	1,120	74.67	257.84	15
Oregon	13,468	1,346.80	3,744.33	10
South Dakota	2	.25	.71	8
Utah	21,319	5,329.75	5,419.02	4
INCLUDED POPULATION	546,795	2,924.04	22,738.22	187

Footnote 3

TABLE F12  
FREE MARKET VALUE BY STATE

<u>State</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Arizona	.50	.58	4
California	.82	.39	56
Colorado	.50	.51	20
Idaho	.80	.42	10
Kansas	1.00	0	16
Montana	.75	.46	8
Nebraska	.63	.52	8
Nevada	.50	.53	10
New Mexico	.82	.40	11
North Dakota	.86	.38	7
Oklahoma	1.00	0	34
Oregon	.78	.44	9
South Dakota	.86	.38	7
Utah	.60	.55	5
Washington	.78	.43	18
Wyoming	.50	.53	8
INCLUDED STATES	.78	.41	231

---

Footnote 2

TABLE F13  
NON-FREE MARKET PROXIES BY STATE

1. Dollar values are values reported by agencies. Values are not total values divided by units of output. It is indicated that it used this division.

<u>State</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Arizona	.50	.58	4
California	.46	.73	59
Colorado	.75	.85	20
Idaho	.30	.48	10
Kansas	.19	.40	16
Montana	1.25	1.17	8
Nebraska	.50	.76	8
Nevada	1.10	.88	10
New Mexico	.91	.94	11
North Dakota	1.29	1.38	7
Oklahoma	.38	.89	34
Oregon	.78	1.39	9
South Dakota	.14	.38	7
Utah	.80	1.30	5
Washington	.50	.99	18
Wyoming	.13	.35	8
INCLUDED STATES	.55	.87	234

---

Footnote 3

APPENDIX G

GRAZING FEE STATISTICS SUMMARIZED  
BY FEE DETERMINATION METHOD

Agencies are sorted by grazing fee determination method. The SPSS software package on the Colorado State University computer was used to compute the statistics displayed. Variables are broken out by total acres, total revenue, animal unit months (AUM's), AUM's per acre, dollar receipts per AUM, dollar receipts per acre, number of leases, number of lessees, lease durations, improvement expenditures, irrigated acres, and responses to questions regarding whether the free market value of grazing was a determinant of the fee charged.

Note that total and mean values displayed are totals and mean values of values reported by responding agencies; agencies not surveyed or which did not respond are obviously not included. Since our survey did not include every agency and not every agency surveyed responded to every question, the totals displayed must not be interpreted as complete sums of measured variables. Statistics displayed in this appendix are totals and means of values reported by responding agencies ONLY.

APPENDIX G

FOOTNOTES:

1. Dollar values are values reported by agencies. Values are not total values divided by units of grazing unless the agency indicated that it used this division.
2. Free market values as reported here is the percent of agencies reporting that "obtaining a fair market price" was "the primary objective in setting the fee rate." See question II-4 of the Questionnaire in Appendix C.
3. Non-free market proxies is a frequency distribution of yes-no responses to question II-5 of the Questionnaire (Appendix C).

TABLE G1

MEAN ACRES BY FEE DETERMINATION METHOD

<u>Fee Determination Method</u>	<u>Mean Value</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Sealed Bids	190,801.20	1,048,120.93	133
Auction	310,824.33	366,753.06	6
Set by Board	954,037.60	1,179,002.51	10
Comparison with Private Rates	40,216.59	118,760.86	81
Negotiated	59,138.57	182,783.93	23
Formula	1,191,397.12	2,772,234.46	26
BLM or USFS	82,938.59	145,270.07	17
ALL METHODS	211,651.66	1,005,607.01	249

TABLE G2

MEAN REVENUE BY METHOD OF FEE DETERMINATION

<u>Fee Determination Method</u>	<u>\$ Mean Value</u>	<u>\$ Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Sealed Bids	200,157.85	908,492.50	132
Auction	521,231.17	592,070.94	6
Set by Board	214,614.88	310,247.09	8
Comparison with Private Rates	107,850.36	617,548.30	80
Negotiated	39,817.10	77,578.64	21
Formula	706,622.88	1,241,610.70	26
BLM or USFS	18,771.76	45,552.92	17
ALL METHODS	193,030.10	806,078.88	244

TABLE G3  
MEAN AUM's BY FEE DETERMINATION METHOD

<u>Fee Determination Method</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mean Value</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Sealed Bids	2,276,764	41,395.71	167,825.58	55
Auction	344,828	172,414.00	225,376.14	2
Set by Board	510,519	85,086.50	108,193.41	6
Comparison with Private Rates	373,955	7,332.45	12,772.83	51
Negotiated	57,013	5,701.30	7,139.09	10
Formula	3,338,068	185,448.22	375,596.97	18
BLM or USFS	91,061	7,004.69	14,960.49	12
ALL METHODS	6,148,471	47,295.93	184,200.38	130

TABLE G4  
AUM/ACRE BY FEE DETERMINATION METHOD

<u>Fee Determination Method</u>		<u>Mean Value</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Sealed Bids		.62	.92	53
Auction		.24	.22	2
Set by Board		1.18	2.37	6
Comparison with Private Rates		.68	.79	49
Negotiated		.90	1.81	10
Formula		.49	.36	18
BLM or USFS		.48	.91	13
ALL METHODS		.63	.83	126
ALL METHODS		7.75	7.41	59

Footnote 1

TABLE G5

\$/AUM BY FEE DETERMINATION METHOD

<u>Fee Determination Method</u>	<u>\$ Mean Value</u>	<u>\$ Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Sealed Bids	7.03	4.16	102
Auction	5.19	1.00	3
Set by Board	6.02	4.86	7
Comparison with Private Rates	5.61	2.74	59
Negotiated	4.58	1.42	16
Formula	5.49	3.24	21
ALL METHODS	6.44	3.79	176

Footnote 1

TABLE G6

MEAN \$/ACRE BY FEE DETERMINATION METHOD

<u>Fee Determination Method</u>	<u>\$ Mean Value</u>	<u>\$ Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Sealed Bids	5.91	7.64	29
Auction	11.62	9.88	3
Set by Board	10.25	7.59	3
Comparison with Private Rates	11.73	11.03	17
Negotiated	7.71	5.60	7
Formula	8.61	11.87	2
BLM or USFS	.15	0	1
ALL METHODS	7.76	9.41	59

Footnote 1

TABLE G7

MEAN NUMBER OF LEASES BY FEE DETERMINATION METHOD

<u>Fee Determination Method</u>	<u>Mean Value</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Sealed Bids	190.78	818.78	134
Auction	934.83	1,415.78	6
Set by Board	835.60	1,139.21	10
Comparison with Private Rates	70.52	421.55	82
Negotiated	101.68	385.63	22
Formula	900.31	1,746.58	26
BLM or USFS	34.71	78.33	17
ALL METHODS	210.96	772.42	251

- 815 -

TABLE G8

MEAN NUMBER OF LESSEES BY FEE DETERMINATION METHOD

<u>Fee Determination Method</u>	<u>Mean Value</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Sealed Bids	91.65	525.13	127
Auction	554.33	808.77	6
Set by Board	739.33	1,097.57	9
Comparison with Private Rates	20.14	64.94	78
Negotiated	9.41	14.08	19
Formula	529.87	1,265.72	23
BLM or USFS	23.20	64.70	15
ALL METHODS	125.55	523.54	237

TABLE G9

MEAN DURATION OF LEASE (YEARS) BY FEE DETERMINATION METHOD

<u>Fee Determination Method</u>	<u>Mean Value</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Sealed Bids	4.45	2.05	137
Auction	4.33	.82	6
Set by Board	6.78	3.63	9
Comparison with Private Rates	2.83	2.60	82
Negotiated	3.26	2.77	23
Formula	4.46	3.47	26
BLM or USFS	4.00	4.03	18
ALL METHODS	3.79	2.60	255

TABLE G10

MEAN IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURES BY FEE DETERMINATION METHOD

<u>Fee Determination Method</u>		\$ Mean Value	\$ Standard Deviation	Number of Observations
Sealed Bids		69275.03	85266.00	103
Auction		500.00	1118.03	5
Set by Board		21692.00	33536.57	8
Comparison with Private Rates		23447.57	40594.76	54
Negotiated		11631.95	31508.25	19
Formula		27172.21	50286.39	19
BLM or USFS		6667.20	25819.47	15
ALL METHODS		43163.67	72836.50	186

Footnote 2

TABLE G11

IRRIGATED ACRES BY FEE DETERMINATION METHOD

<u>Fee Determination Method</u>	<u>Mean Value</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Sealed Bids	591.18	2604.32	73
Auction	4096.17	10023.72	6
Set by Board	16100.80	47150.07	10
Comparison with Private Rates	828.57	3791.48	70
Negotiated	123.52	276.30	23
Formula	13089.48	54106.02	25
BLM or USFS	874.63	2522.27	16
ALL METHODS	2924.04	22738.22	187

TABLE G12

PERCENT FREE MARKET VALUE BY FEE DETERMINATION METHOD

<u>Fee Determination Method</u>	<u>Mean Value</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Sealed Bids	.90	.30	130
Auction	.83	.41	6
Set by Board	.67	.50	9
Comparison with Private Rates	.79	.41	67
Negotiated	.70	.47	23
Formula	.73	.46	22
BLM or USFS	.22	.43	18
ALL METHODS	.78	.41	231

Footnote 2

Values reported by nonbonding agencies, agencies not surveyed or which did not respond are obviously not included. Since our survey did not include every agency and every agency surveyed responded to every question, the totals displayed not be interpreted as complete sum of measured variables. Statistics displayed in this appendix are totals and means of values reported by responding agencies ONLY.

TABLE G13

NON-FREE MARKET PROXIES BY FEE DETERMINATION METHOD

<u>Fee Determination Method</u>	<u>Mean Value</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
Sealed Bids	.31	.68	132
Auction	.50	1.23	6
Set by Board	1.00	1.41	9
Comparison with Private Rates	.77	1.02	68
Negotiated	1.13	.97	23
Formula	1.17	1.27	23
BLM or USFS	.50	.99	18
ALL METHODS	.55	.87	234

Footnote 3

APPENDIX H  
GRAZING FEE STATISTICS

APPENDIX H ATC 531 201300  
1. Dollar values are totals and mean values reported by responding agencies. Values are not based  
on a unit of grazing. Total values are agency indicated that  
"paid" or "not paid" or "not known".  
2. Fair market value is the percentage of agencies  
that responded.

GRAZING FEE STATISTICS SUMMARIZED  
BY TENANT RIGHTS

Agencies are sorted by a frequency distribution of responses to five questions regarding tenants rights. See question III-8 of the Questionnaire (Appendix C). The SPSS software package on the Colorado State University computer was used to compute the statistics displayed. Variables are broken out by total acres, total revenue, animal unit months (AUM's), AUM's per acre, dollar receipts per AUM, dollar receipts per acre, number of leases, number of lessees, lease durations, improvement expenditures, irrigated acres, and responses to questions regarding whether the free market value of grazing was a determinant of the fee charged.

Note that total and mean values displayed are totals and mean values of values reported by responding agencies; agencies not surveyed or which did not respond are obviously not included. Since our survey did not include every agency and not every agency surveyed responded to every question, the totals displayed must not be interpreted as complete sums of measured variables. Statistics displayed in this appendix are totals and means of values reported by responding agencies ONLY.

## APPENDIX H

### GRAZING FEE STATISTICS SUMMARIZED BY TENANT RIGHTS

Agencies are sorted by a frequency distribution of responses to five questions regarding tenants rights. Agencies answering yes to "one only" question are sorted into the "1" category in the table; agencies answering yes to "two only" questionare sorted into the "2" category in the table; and so forth. See question II-8 of the Questionnaire (Appendix C).

The SPSS software package on the Colorado State University computer was used to compute the statistics displayed. Variables are broken out by total acres, total revenue, animal unit months (AUM's), AUM's per acre, dollar receipts per AUM, dollar receipts per acre, number of leases, number of lessees, lease durations, improvement expenditures, irrigated acres, and responses to questions regarding whether the free market value of grazing was a determinant of the fee charged.

Note that total and mean values displayed are totals and mean values of values reported by responding agencies; agencies not surveyed, or which did not respond are obviously not included. Since our survey did not include every agency and not every agency surveyed responded to every question, the totals displayed must not be interpreted as complete sums of measured variables. Statistics displayed in this appendix are totals and means of values reported by responding agencies ONLY.

The five questions regarding tenant rights are:

Does the grazing tenant in the lease have the right to:

- control hunting or fishing?
- control all access?
- control vehicle access?
- control wildlife?
- use other resources, e.g., timber, water, etc.?

APPENDIX H

FOOTNOTES:

1. Dollar values are values reported by agencies. Values are not total values divided by units of grazing unless the agency indicated that it used this division.
2. Fair market value as reported here is the percentage of agencies reporting that "obtaining a fair market price" was "the primary objective in setting the fee rate." See question II-4 of the Questionnaire in Appendix C.
3. Non-free market proxies is a frequency distribution of yes-no responses to question II-5 of the Questionnaire (Appendix C).
4. Tenant Rights is a frequency distribution of questions pertaining to tenant rights.

TABLE H1

TOTAL ACRES BY TENANT RIGHTS

<u>Tenant Rights</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
0	33,497,570	176303.84	1059180.13	190
1	2,359,347	98306.13	210979.20	24
2	5,652,752	807536.43	1329746.94	7
3	6,285,360	419024.33	742103.12	15
4	758,360	94795.00	246846.42	8
5	4,090,430	4090430.00	0	1
ALL OBSERVATIONS	52,643,983	214873.41	1013494.39	245

More than half of the acreage leased is leased to tenants who have no rights to control the acreage.

The five questions regarding tenant rights are:

Does the grazing tenant in the lease have the right to:

- control hunting or fishing?
- control all access?
- control vehicle access?
- control wildlife?
- use other resources, e.g., timber, water, etc.?

TABLE H 2

TOTAL AUM's BY TENANT RIGHTS

<u>Tenant Rights</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
0	4,557,322	45122.12	199198.70	101
1	321,500	21436.67	38275.55	15
2	1,185,012	592506.00	479804.48	2
3	1,059,687	132460.88	237161.16	8
4	4,543	2271.50	1878.78	2
5	0	0	0	0
ALL OBSERVATIONS	7,128,125	55688.48	203716.17	128

More than one-half of AUM's leased are leased without granting tenant rights.

TABLE H 3

MEAN \$/AUM BY TENANT RIGHTS

<u>Tenant Rights</u>	<u>\$ Mean</u>	<u>\$ Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
0	6.47	3.75	138
1	7.17	4.84	18
2	8.50	5.27	3
3	4.52	1.61	10
4	4.61	5.11	2
5	3.47	0	1
ALL OBSERVATIONS	6.42	3.83	172

Footnote 1

TABLE H 4

MEAN \$/ACRE BY TENANT RIGHTS

<u>Tenant Rights</u>		\$ <u>Mean</u>	\$ <u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
0	16.751	6.39	8.71	40
1	38.622	8.38	13.77	4
2	60.666	9.20	6.56	4
3	75.318	12.22	13.45	7
4	76.9701	11.63	6.10	4
5	76.887	0	0	0
ALL OBSERVATIONS		7.76	9.41	59

Footnote 1

As tenant rights increase, fee increases. Category sample site may bias this table.

TABLE H5  
NUMBER OF LEASES BY TENANT RIGHTS

<u>Tenant Rights</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
0	21,724	114.94	553.46	189
1	4,039	168.29	393.00	24
2	9,254	1156.75	1729.71	8
3	9,030	564.38	1076.31	16
4	2,868	318.67	788.70	9
5	6,000	6000.00	0	1
ALL OBSERVATIONS	52,915	214.23	778.24	247

More than one-half of leases are leased giving tenants some control of the grazing site.

TABLE H6  
NUMBER OF LESSEES BY TENANT RIGHTS

<u>Tenant Rights</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
0	16,751	92.04	495.71	182
1	2,212	100.55	309.81	22
2	3,576	510.86	920.94	7
3	5,318	379.86	813.59	14
4	1,862	232.75	559.23	8
5	0	0	0	0
ALL OBSERVATIONS	29,719	127.55	527.80	233

More than one-half of the lessees have no tenant rights.

TABLE H7

MEAN LEASE DURATION (YEARS) BY TENANT RIGHTS

<u>Tenant Rights</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
0	3.66	2.49	192
1	3.85	2.98	26
2	4.88	3.09	8
3	5.31	2.58	16
4	3.00	1.85	8
5	10.00	0	1
ALL OBSERVATIONS	3.83	2.60	251

Lease duration does not vary with the degree of tenant control of the grazing site.

APPENDIX I

Grazing Fee Statistics Summarized by  
Non-Free Market Proxies

Agencies are sorted by a frequency response of yes-no questions designed to measure non-free market determinants of grazing fees. See question II-5 of the Questionnaire (Appendix C). The SPSS software package on the Colorado State University computer was used to compute the statistics displayed. Variables are broken out by: total revenue, dollar receipts per AUM, and dollar receipts per acre.

Note that total and mean values displayed are totals and mean values of values reported by responding agencies; agencies not surveyed or which did not respond are obviously not included. Since our survey did not include every agency and not every agency surveyed responded to every question, the totals displayed must not be interpreted as complete sums of measured variables. Statistics displayed in this appendix are totals and means of values reported by responding agencies ONLY.

APPENDIX I

FOOTNOTES:

1. Dollar values are values reported by agencies. Values are not total values divided by units of grazing unless the agency indicated that it used this division.

SI EBAT

TABLE II  
MEAN TOTAL REVENUE BY NON-FREE MARKET PROXIES

<u>Non-Free Market Proxies</u>	<u>Mean Value</u>	<u>\$ Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
0	121,202.51	454,141.22	139
1	60,516.80	209,182.46	59
2	23,734.44	40,100.75	9
3	631,928.50	1,716,837.97	10
4	1,599,398.33	2,588,939.99	3
INCLUDED POPULATION	144,312.41	605,508.94	220

Total revenues seem to climb with non-market influences. Sample size in the categories may bias this effect.

Fees are greater for agencies indicating no non-market influence than for agencies indicating some non-market influence.

TABLE I2

\$/AUM BY NON-FREE MARKET PROXIES

<u>Non-Free Market Proxies</u>	<u>\$ Mean Value</u>	<u>\$ Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
0	6.96	3.95	92
1	5.91	4.01	45
2	6.04	4.30	6
3	5.86	4.29	7
4	4.52	3.09	3
INCLUDED POPULATION	6.52	3.97	153

Footnote 1

\$/AUM or grazing fee decreases with an increase in non-market influences.

TABLE I3

\$/ACRE BY NON-FREE MARKET PROXIES

	\$ Mean Value	\$ Standard Deviation	Number of Observations
0. Free market values as reported by the agency	8.08	10.18	38
1. Indicating "no influence" or "not applicable"	7.49	9.13	14
2. Getting the fee rate "from memory"	7.31	6.65	4
3. Appendix E.	7.63	6.19	2
INCLUDED POPULATION	7.87	9.46	58

Footnote 1

Fees are greater for agencies indicating no non-market influence than for agencies indicating some non-market influence.

APPENDIX J

Grazing Fee Statistics Summarized by Type of Agency

Agencies are sorted by types of agencies. The SPSS software package on the Colorado State University computer was used to compute the statics displayed. Variables are broken out by total acres, total revenue, animal unit months (AUM's), AUM's per acre, dollar receipts per AUM, dollar receipts per acre, number of leases, number of lessees, lease durations, improvement expenditures, irrigated acres, and responses to questions regarding whether the free market value of grazing was a determinant of the fee charged.

Note that total and mean values displayed are totals and mean values of values reported by responding agencies; agencies not surveyed or which did not respond are obviously not included. Since our survey did not include every agency and not every agency surveyed responded to every question, the totals displayed must not be interpreted as complete sums of measured variables. Statistics displayed in this appendix are totals and means of values reported by responding agencies ONLY.

APPENDIX J

FOOTNOTES:

1. Dollar values are values reported by agencies. Values are not total values divided by units of grazing unless the agency indicated that it used this division.
2. Free market values as reported here is the percent of agencies reporting that "obtaining a fair market price" was "the primary objective in getting the fee rate." See question II-4 of the Questionnaire in Appendix C.
3. Non-free market proxies is a frequency distribution of yes-no responses to question II-5 of the Questionnaire (Appendix C).

TABLE J1

TOTAL ACRES BY TYPE OF AGENCY

Type of Agency	State or Agency	Total	Mean Value	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations
State	Arizona	8,775,023	8,775,023.00	0	1
	California	130,625	32,656.25	41,486.98	4
	Colorado	2,775	1,387.349.00	1,891,297.09	2
	Idaho	2,104,260	701,420.00	1,202,547.81	3
	Kansas	8,092	8,092.00	0	1
	Montana	4,272,106	2,136,053.00	2,763,906.46	2
	Nebraska	1,236,349	618,174.50	872,812.31	2
	Nevada	91,986	45,993.00	63,713.15	2
	New Mexico	11,022,097	5,511,048.50	7,708,946.72	2
	North Dakota	718,450	359,225.00	488,999.69	2
	Oklahoma	625,000	625,000.00	0	1
	Oregon	692,039	230,679.67	328,882.62	3
	South Dakota	845,305	845,305.00	0	1
	Utah	3,065,453	1,021,817.67	1,552,774.80	3
	Washington	1,056,531	352,177.00	468,573.83	3
	Wyoming	3,700,073	1,233,357.67	2,062,498.40	3
Local	California	383,160	23,947.50	59,492.19	16
	Colorado	9,082	1,816.40	2,241.83	5
	Idaho	501	250.50	212.84	2
	Nebraska	4,199	839.80	1,475.18	5
	Nevada	6,000	6,000.00	0	1
	New Mexico	3,954	1,977.00	2,153.85	2
	Oregon	683	341.50	313.25	2
Federal	South Dakota	220	110.00	98.99	2
	Washington	3,167	633.40	1,323.95	5
	Agr. Res. Serv.	165,735	55,245.00	77,899.37	3
	Air Force	86,878	7,898.00	12,369.46	11
	Army	421,241	24,778.88	54,306.96	17
	Corps of Eng.	155,492	3,455.38	6,369.82	45
	Navy	85,818	12,259.71	16,575.48	7
	BIA	7,829,411	289,978.19	533,276.20	27
	BOR	230,374	17,721.08	30,866.71	13
	USFWS	1,796,095	46,053.72	152,996.73	39
	NPS	401,167	33,430.58	59,072.25	12
ALL AGENCIES		52,701,263	211,651.66	1,005,607.01	249

- 237 -  
TABLE J2

TOTAL REVENUE BY TYPE OF AGENCY

<u>Type of Agency</u>	<u>State or Agency</u>	<u>\$ Total</u>	<u>\$ Mean Value</u>	<u>\$ Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
State	Arizona	1,482,822	1,482,822.00	0	1
	California	10,213,032	2,042,606.40	4,448,740.13	5
	Colorado	10,019,999	5,009,999.50	7,056,924.97	2
	Idaho	958,479	319,493.00	497,834.42	3
	Kansas	105,808	105,808.00	0	1
	Montana	9,763,837	4,881,918.67	4,977,238.10	3
	Nebraska	10,002,730	5,001,365.00	7,069,135.99	2
	Nevada	26,855	13,427.50	2,584.48	2
	New Mexico	13,013,659	6,506,829.50	4,940,087.68	2
	North Dakota	1,022,817	511,408.50	690,972.73	2
	Oklahoma	3,700,705	3,700,705.00	0	1
	Oregon	321,401	107,133.67	98,198.99	3
	South Dakota	1,384,872	1,384,872.00	0	1
	Utah	463,167	154,389.00	223,976.51	3
	Washington	388,272	129,424.00	181,545.36	3
	Wyoming	1,620,676	540,225.33	864,104.02	3
Local	California	12,042,619	752,663.69	2,476,858.92	16
	Colorado	47,400	9,480.00	9,044.55	5
	Idaho	1,500	750.00	353.55	2
	Nebraska	41,100	8,220.00	11,013.49	5
	Nevada	6,744	6,744.00	0	1
	New Mexico	4,000	2,000.00	1,979.90	2
	Oregon	4,120	2,060.00	2,743.57	2
	South Dakota	2,160	1,080.00	56.57	2
Federal	Washington	2,945	589.20	343.75	5
	Agr. Res. Serv.	93,950	31,316.67	10,088.40	3
	Air Force	10,292,414	935,674.00	3,006,667.35	11
	Army	10,893,240	605,180.00	2,346,603.25	18
	Corps of Eng.	394,069	8,757.09	13,777.82	45
	Navy	236,761	33,823.00	46,563.59	7
	BIA	52,145,001	1,738,166.70	3,334,074.17	30
	BOR	30,245,192	2,016,346.13	4,132,005.59	15
	USFWS	11,162,331	272,251.98	1,557,838.43	41
	NPS	112,732	9,394.33	20,533.49	12
ALL AGENCIES		197,099,329	761,001.27	2,424,831.89	259

TABLE J3  
TOTAL AUM's BY TYPE OF AGENCY

Type of Agency	State or Agency	Total	Mean Value	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations
State	Arizona	1,269,840	1,269,840.00	0	1
	California	3,346	1,673.00	2,300.93	2
	Colorado	2,500	2,500.00	0	1
	Idaho	277,470	138,735.00	191,293.60	2
	Kansas	3,608	3,608.00	0	1
	Montana	14,930	14,930.00	0	1
	Nebraska	495	495.00	0	1
	Nevada	6,502	3,251.00	2,213.24	2
	North Dakota	1,470	1,470.00	0	1
	Oklahoma	650,000	650,000.00	0	1
	Oregon	78,063	26,021.00	28,230.27	3
	South Dakota	331,779	331,779.00	0	1
	Utah	153,000	153,000.00	0	1
Local	Washington	13,800	6,900.00	8,695.99	2
	Wyoming	946,667	315,555.67	533,665.06	3
	California	117,569	16,795.57	16,754.08	7
	Colorado	1,450	1,450.00	0	1
	Idaho	140	140.00	0	1
	Nebraska	90	90.00	0	1
Federal	New Mexico	200	200.00	0	1
	Oregon	943	943.00	0	1
	Agr. Res. Serv.	12,220	4,073.33	2,943.49	3
	Air Force	17,561	5,853.67	5,207.27	3
	Army	57,463	9,577.17	13,221.81	6
	Corps of Eng.	3,115	623.00	1,123.73	6
	Navy	23,632	3,376.00	3,558.52	7
	F.B.I.	1,841,137	115,071.06	297,325.58	16
	B.O.R.	8,011	2,002.75	2,086.19	4
	U.S.F.W.S.	264,723	6,456.66	11,940.36	41
	N.P.S.	46,747	4,674.70	9,060.03	10
ALL AGENCIES		6,148,471	47,295.93	184,200.38	130

- 239 -  
TABLE J4

AUM/ACRE BY AGENCY

<u>Type of Agency</u>	<u>State or Agency</u>	<u>Mean Value</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
State	Arizona	.14	0	1
	California	.03	.01	2
	Colorado	.05	0	1
	Idaho	.43	.42	2
	Kansas	.45	0	1
	Montana	.08	0	1
	Nebraska	.49	0	1
	Nevada	.92	1.23	2
	North Dakota	.11	0	1
	Oklahoma	1.04	0	1
	Oregon	.13	.13	3
	South Dakota	.39	0	1
	Utah	.05	0	1
	Washington	.09	.02	2
	Wyoming	.21	.07	3
Local	California	1.32	2.08	7
	Colorado	.25	0	1
	Idaho	.35	0	1
	Nebraska	1.64	0	1
	New Mexico	.44	0	1
	Oregon	1.68	0	1
Federal	Agr. Res. Serv.	.51	.60	3
	Air Force	.49	.43	3
	Army	.49	.51	6
	Corps of Eng.	.61	.41	5
	Navy	.95	.72	7
	Bur. of Ind. Aff.	.20	.20	14
	Bur. of Recl.	1.03	.85	4
	Fish & Wildlife Serv.	.75	.80	39
	Nat. Park Serv.	.78	1.04	10
	ALL AGENCIES	.63	.83	126

- 240 -  
TABLE J5

MEAN DOLLARS/AUM BY TYPE OF AGENCY

<u>Type of Agency</u>	<u>State or Agency</u>	<u>\$ Mean Value</u>	<u>\$ Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
State	Arizona	1.43	0	1
	California	5.50	3.54	2
	Colorado	5.50	3.54	2
	Idaho	4.92	.63	3
	Kansas	10.21	0	1
	Montana	5.98	4.35	3
	Nebraska	9.94	5.75	2
	Nevada	4.63	.88	2
	New Mexico	4.15	1.20	2
	North Dakota	7.00	0	1
	Oklahoma	5.70	0	1
	Oregon	3.40	2.11	3
	South Dakota	5.06	0	1
Local	Utah	4.68	2.05	3
	Washington	3.59	.58	3
	Wyoming	7.00	0	1
	California	8.39	7.36	10
	Colorado	5.38	2.30	2
	Nevada	4.50	0	1
	New Mexico	3.00	0	1
Federal	Oregon	8.22	0	1
	South Dakota	6.22	0	1
	Washington	4.00	1.41	2
	Agr. Res. Serv.	5.14	.79	2
	Air Force	12.68	4.59	8
	Army	11.08	2.55	10
	Corps of Eng.	5.05	2.35	39
	Navy	11.34	.00	7
	Bur. of Ind. Aff.	6.02	3.52	19
	Bur. of Recl.	6.51	3.37	3
	Fish & Wildlife Serv.	5.49	2.26	38
	Nat. Park Serv.	4.00	0	1
	ALL AGENCIES	6.44	3.79	176

TABLE J6

DOLLARS/ACRE BY TYPE OF AGENCY

Type of Agency	State or Agency	\$ Mean Value	\$ Standard Deviation	Number of Observations
State	California	9.09	5.86	2
	South Dakota	.22	0	1
Local	California	12.26	3.75	6
	Colorado	11.85	9.73	3
	Idaho	5.63	6.19	2
	Nebraska	12.15	6.70	5
	Nevada	1.50	0	1
	New Mexico	.97	0	1
	Oregon	1.00	0	1
	South Dakota	26.00	0	1
	Washington	19.33	17.94	4
	Air Force	1.56	.50	3
Federal	Army	.49	.45	7
	Corps of Eng.	.98	.00	7
	Bur. of Ind. Aff.	8.90	10.67	9
	Bur. of Recl.	11.26	10.99	5
	Fish & Wildlife Serv.	.46	0	1
	ALL AGENCIES	7.76	9.41	59

Footnote 1

- 242 -  
TABLE J7

NUMBER OF LEASES BY TYPE OF AGENCY

<u>Type of Agency</u>	<u>State or Agency</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mean Value</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
State	Arizona	1,565	1,565.00	0	1
	California	59	14.75	8.10	4
	Colorado	3,012	1,506.00	2,112.84	2
	Idaho	1,618	539.33	918.56	3
	Kansas	6	6.00	0	1
	Montana	6,325	3,162.50	4,012.83	2
	Nebraska	887	443.50	622.96	2
	Nevada	6	3.00	0	2
	New Mexico	5,513	2,756.50	3,864.34	2
	North Dakota	2,460	1,230.00	1,654.63	2
	Oklahoma	800	800.00	0	1
	Oregon	311	103.67	135.71	3
	South Dakota	3,082	3,082.00	0	1
	Utah	2,562	854.00	1,425.49	3
Local	Washington	1,914	638.00	1,019.63	3
	Wyoming	3,967	1,322.33	2,231.52	3
	California	183	11.44	16.61	16
	Colorado	19	3.80	6.26	5
	Idaho	10	5.00	5.66	2
	Nebraska	26	1.40	.55	5
	Nevada	32	32.00	0	1
	New Mexico	2	1.00	0	2
Federal	Oregon	4	2.00	1.41	2
	South Dakota	2	1.00	0	2
	Washington	12	2.40	1.52	5
	Agr. Res. Serv.	3	1.00	0	3
	Air Force	22	2.20	2.25	10
	Army	37	2.06	1.76	18
	Corps of Eng.	330	18.44	28.61	45
	Navy	15	2.14	1.46	7
	Bur. of Ind. Aff.	16,282	626.23	1,058.27	26
	Bur. of Recl.	824	54.93	135.36	15
	Fish & Wildlife Serv.	469	11.44	13.51	41
	Nat. Park Serv.	110	10.00	12.88	11
	ALL AGENCIES	5,2951	210.96	772.42	251

TABLE J8  
NUMBER OF LESSEES BY TYPE OF AGENCY

Type of Agency	State or Agency	Total	Mean Value	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations
State	Arizona	1450	1,450.00	0	1
	California	41	13.67	9.24	3
	Colorado	2762	1,381.00	1,936.06	2
	Idaho	1218	406.00	687.62	3
	Kansas	6	6.00	0	1
	Nebraska	3	3.00	0	1
	Nevada	13	6.50	4.95	2
	New Mexico	5489	5,489.00	0	1
	North Dakota	1660	830.00	1,088.94	2
	Oklahoma	700	700.00	0	1
	Oregon	309	103.00	134.57	3
	South Dakota	1596	1,596.00	0	1
	Utah	2408	802.67	1,333.13	3
	Washington	89	44.50	43.13	2
	Wyoming	2596	865.33	1,444.31	3
Local	California	163	10.19	13.85	16
	Colorado	2	4.00	6.16	5
	Idaho	10	5.00	5.66	2
	Nebraska	7	1.40	.55	5
	Nevada	32	32.00	0	1
	New Mexico	2	1.00	0	2
	Oregon	4	2.00	1.41	2
	South Dakota	2	1.00	0	2
Federal	Washington	12	2.40	1.52	5
	Agr. Res. Serv.	3	1.00	0	3
	Air Force	21	2.10	2.18	10
	Army	29	1.61	1.04	18
	Corps of Eng.	757	16.82	25.75	45
	Navy	12	1.71	1.11	7
	Bur. of Ind. Aff.	7207	360.35	594.74	20
	Bur. of Recl.	551	42.38	128.60	13
	Fish & Wild. Serv.	490	11.95	15.91	41
	Nat. Park Serv.	93	8.45	9.69	11
ALL AGENCIES		29255	125.55	523.54	237

TABLE J9

MEAN LEASE DURATION (YEARS) BY TYPE OF AGENCY

Type of Agency	State or Agency	Mean Value	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations
State	Arizona	10.00	0	1
	California	6.00	3.81	5
	Colorado	5.50	6.36	2
	Idaho	7.00	5.20	3
	Kansas	3.00	0	1
	Montana	7.00	5.20	3
	Nebraska	4.50	4.95	2
	Nevada	2.50	2.12	2
	New Mexico	5.00	0	2
	North Dakota	3.00	2.83	2
	Oklahoma	5.00	0	1
	Oregon	4.00	5.20	3
	South Dakota	5.00	0	1
	Utah	6.00	3.61	3
	Washington	7.67	4.04	3
	Wyoming	5.00	4.36	3
Local	California	3.33	1.84	15
	Colorado	3.00	1.41	5
	Idaho	3.00	2.83	2
	Nebraska	2.60	2.19	5
	Nevada	1.00	0	1
	New Mexico	3.50	2.12	2
	Oregon	1.00	0	2
	South Dakota	3.00	0	2
	Washington	2.60	1.82	5
Federal	Agr. Res. Serv.	7.00	5.20	3
	Air Force	5.00	0	11
	Army	5.00	0	17
	Corps of Eng.	5.00	0	45
	Navy	5.00	0	7
	Bur. of Ind. Aff.	3.43	2.14	30
	Bur. of Recl.	1.36	1.08	14
	Fish & Wildlife Serv.	1.50	2.26	40
	Nat. Park Serv.	3.92	3.32	12
	ALL AGENCIES	3.79	2.60	255

TABLE J10

IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURES BY TYPE OF AGENCY

Type of Agency	State or Agency	Total	\$ Mean Value	\$ Standard Deviation	Number of Observations
State	Arizona	0	0	0	1
	California	0	0	0	2
	Colorado	60,000	60,000.00	0	1
	Idaho	0	0	0	1
	Kansas	21,506	21,506.00	0	1
	Montana	0	0	0	2
	Nebraska	0	0	0	2
	Nevada	1,584	792.00	1,120.06	2
	New Mexico	0	0	0	2
	North Dakota	0	0	0	2
	Oklahoma	175,000	175,000.00	0	1
	Oregon	25,000	25,000.00	0	1
	South Dakota	2,500	2,500.00	0	1
	Utah	156,850	52,283.33	45,753.59	3
	Washington	21,000	10,500.00	14,849.24	2
	Wyoming	7,782	3,891.00	5,502.71	2
Local	California	28,800	2,400.00	8,219.82	12
	Colorado	8,500	1,700.00	2,387.47	5
	Idaho	0	0	0	2
	Nebraska	0	0	0	5
	Nevada	0	0	0	5
	New Mexico	0	0	0	2
	Oregon	5,300	2,650.00	3,747.67	2
	South Dakota	0	0	0	2
Federal	Washington	0	0	0	4
	ARS	0	0	0	1
	Air Force	23,690	3,948.33	9,671.40	6
	Army	599,024	9,359.75	22,533.00	8
	Corps of Eng.	0	0	0	5
	Bur. of Ind. Aff.	262,000	13,100.00	24,685.18	20
	Bur. of Recl.	144,545	9,636.33	33,442.24	15
	USFWS	68,400	4,023.53	10,768.27	17
	NPS	0	0	0	1
	ALL AGENCIES	1,087,371	7,551.19	23,635.34	144

- 246 -  
TABLE J11

IRRIGATED ACRES BY TYPE OF AGENCY

<u>Type of Agency</u>	<u>State of Agency</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mean Value</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
State	Arizona	0	0	0	1
	California	0	0	0	4
	Colorado	115,000	77,500.00	102,530.48	2
	Idaho	4,046	1,348.67	1,691.13	3
	Montana	0	0	0	2
	Nebraska	0	0	0	2
	Nevada	520	520.00	0	1
	New Mexico	0	0	0	2
	North Dakota	0	0	0	1
	Oklahoma	1,000	1,000.00	0	1
	Oregon	12,388	4,129.33	6,808.74	3
	South Dakota	0	0	0	1
	Utah	11,320	3,773.33	5,432.69	3
	Washington	24,557	8,185.67	14,177.99	3
Local	Wyoming	271,458	90,486.00	156,430.26	3
	California	117,918	1,119.88	4,237.54	16
	Colorado	4,478	895.60	941.90	5
	Idaho	0	0	0	2
	Nebraska	100	20.00	44.72	5
	Nevada	0	0	0	1
	New Mexico	0	0	0	2
	Oregon	80	40.00	56.57	2
	South Dakota	0	0	0	2
	Washington	21	4.20	8.84	5
Federal	Agr. Res. Serv.	120	40.00	69.28	3
	Air Force	0	0	0	11
	Army	0	0	0	4
	Corps of Eng.	114	22.80	43.58	5
	Bur. of Ind. Aff.	26,547	948.11	4,047.98	28
	Bur. of Recl.	35	2.50	7.00	14
	Fish & Wildlife Serv.	4,249	108.95	312.94	39
	Nat. Park Serv.	12,845	1,284.50	3,168.78	10
	ALL AGENCIES	548,795	2,924.04	22,738.22	187

TABLE J12

FREE MARKET VALUE BY TYPE OF AGENCY

<u>Agency</u>	<u>State or Agency</u>	<u>Mean Value</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number of Observations</u>
State	Arizona	1.00	0	1
	California	.80	.45	5
	Colorado	.50	.71	2
	Idaho	1.00	0	3
	Kansas	1.00	0	1
	Montana	.67	.58	3
	Nebraska	1.00	0	2
	Nevada	1.00	0	2
	New Mexico	1.00	0	2
	North Dakota	1.00	0	2
	Oklahoma	1.00	0	1
	Oregon	.33	.58	3
	South Dakota	1.00	0	1
Local	Utah	.67	.58	3
	Washington	.67	.58	3
	Wyoming	.33	.58	3
	California	.67	.49	15
	Colorado	.40	.55	5
	Idaho	.50	.71	2
	Nebraska	.40	.55	5
Federal	New Mexico	1.00	0	2
	Oregon	1.00	0	2
	South Dakota	.50	.71	2
	Washington	.60	.55	5
	Agr. Res. Serv.	.67	.58	3
	Air Force	.91	.30	11
	Army	1.00	0	18
Corps of Eng.		1.00	0	45
Navy		1.00	0	7
Bur. of Ind. Aff.		.78	.42	23
Bur. of Recl.		.62	.51	13
Fish & Wildlife Serv.		.83	.38	24
Nat. Park Serv.		.17	.39	12
ALL AGENCIES		.78	.41	231

TABLE J13

NON-FREE MARKET PROXIES BY AGENCY

Type of Agency	State or Agency	Mean Value	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations
State	Arizona	1.00	0	1
	California	.20	.45	5
	Colorado	1.50	.71	2
	Idaho	.33	.58	3
	Kansas	1.00	0	1
	Montana	2.00	1.73	3
	Nebraska	1.50	.71	2
	Nevada	1.50	.71	2
	New Mexico	0	0	2
	North Dakota	.50	.71	2
	Oklahoma	0	0	1
	Oregon	2.00	2.00	3
	South Dakota	0	0	1
	Utah	1.33	1.53	3
	Washington	2.00	1.73	3
	Wyoming	.33	.58	3
Local	California	.63	.62	16
	Colorado	1.40	1.14	5
	Idaho	0	0	2
	Nebraska	.20	.45	5
	New Mexico	1.00	1.41	2
	Oregon	.50	.71	2
	South Dakota	.50	.71	2
Federal	Washington	.20	.45	5
	Agr. Res. Serv.	.67	.58	3
	Air Force	.45	.52	11
	Army	0	0	18
	Corps of Eng.	.09	.36	45
	Navy	0	0	7
	Bur. of Ind. Aff.	.70	1.02	23
	Bur. of Recl.	.67	.82	15
	Fish & Wildlife Serv.	1.25	1.03	24
	Nat. Park Serv.	.17	.39	12
	ALL AGENCIES	.55	.87	234

4. Has your agency altered its ~~range improvement~~ since 1961?  no  yes

## APPENDIX K

### FORMS FOR UPDATING SURVEY

#### 1. Variable Fee System

Information on how range fees are established will be provided under the following categories:

- a. percentage of gross revenue
- b. percentage of net revenue
- c. variable fee system

Information on how range fees are established will be provided under the following categories:

- a. percentage of gross revenue
- b. percentage of net revenue
- c. variable fee system

#### II. Lease Rates and Utilizations

- 1. duration of lease
- 2. classification for lease
- 3. tenure rights
- 4. lease management
- 5. lease use management
- 6. range improvement regular
- 7. other

#### C. Expenditures and Receipts of Range Fees

- 1. percentage retained by agency  90.63%
- 2. disbursement of non-retained fees
- 3. disbursement of other non-retained fees
- 4. sources of non-fee funds

#### III. Range Improvement Expenditures

- 1. amounts of range improvements to county units
- 2. amounts of range improvements to state governments
- 3. other

#### 5. What year did your agency first implement its ~~range improvement~~ policy to income taxes?

##### A. Reason for fee policy change

- 1. tax law or state law  1
- 2. state MIA or state ARI  1
- 3. other  2

##### B. Reason for lease policy change

- 1. tax law or state law  2
- 2. state MIA or state ARI  2
- 3. other  2

##### C. Reason for ~~range improvement~~ policy change

- 1. tax law or state law  3
- 2. state MIA or state ARI  3
- 3. other  2

##### D. Reason for range improvements policy change

TELEPHONE FORM

GRAZING LEASING ARRANGEMENTS AND USER CHARGES UPDATE SURVEY

This is the telephone component of the grazing update survey. Response to this survey is voluntary and not required by law. However, cooperation should be encouraged to ensure timely and accurate information.

Information obtained from page two of this telephone survey is used to determine which, if any of the four policy change survey forms (Fee Determination, Lease Policy, Expenditures and Receipts, or Range Improvements) should be included with the Short Form mail questionnaire that will be sent to this agency.

1. A. Agency Name \_\_\_\_\_

B. Address \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ State Zip Code \_\_\_\_\_

C. Please indicate government agency type     
Federal State Local

D. Name of Contact Person \_\_\_\_\_ First Initial \_\_\_\_\_ Last \_\_\_\_\_

E. Telephone Number of Contact Person \_\_\_\_\_ Area Code \_\_\_\_\_ Number \_\_\_\_\_

2. The total amount of grazing receipts collected by your agency was?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ in 1982

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ in 1983

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ in 1984

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ in 1985

3. The grazing fee charged by your agency was?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ per AUM or \$ \_\_\_\_\_ per Acre in 1982

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ per AUM or \$ \_\_\_\_\_ per Acre in 1983

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ per AUM or \$ \_\_\_\_\_ per Acre in 1984

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ per AUM or \$ \_\_\_\_\_ per Acre in 1985

TELEPHONE FORM

2/2

4. Has your agency altered its grazing policy since 1981?  No  Yes

If yes, please indicate policy changes and the year of change.

A. Fee Determination

1. method of fee determination
2. variable fee system
3. items included
4. rate basis
5. other

(year)

---

---

---

---

---

B. Lease Rights and Obligations

1. duration of lease
2. qualification for lease
3. renewal rights
4. lease management
5. other use management
6. range improvement transfer
7. other

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

C. Expenditures and Receipts of Grazing Fees

1. percentage retained by agency
2. distribution of non-retained fees
3. distribution of retained fees
4. sources of non-fee funds
5. other

---

---

---

---

---

D. Range Improvement Expenditures (excludes maintenance or costs of grazing)

1. amounts of range improvement
2. rebate or discounts on improvements
3. other

---

---

---

5. What was the reason for the policy change?

A. Reason for fee policy change \_\_\_\_\_

---

B. Reason for lease policy change \_\_\_\_\_

---

C. Reason for expenditure and receipt policy change \_\_\_\_\_

---

D. Reason for range improvements policy change \_\_\_\_\_

---

SHORT FORM

GRAZING LEASING ARRANGEMENTS AND USER CHARGES UPDATE SURVEY

Please complete the following questions to the best of your knowledge. Response to this survey is voluntary and not required by law. However, your cooperation is very important to ensure timely and accurate information.

1. General

A. Agency Name \_\_\_\_\_

B. Address \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

State

Zip Code

C. Please indicate government agency type

Federal

State

Local

D. Name of Contact Person \_\_\_\_\_  
First Initial \_\_\_\_\_ Last \_\_\_\_\_

E. Telephone Number of Contact Person \_\_\_\_\_  
Area Code \_\_\_\_\_ Number \_\_\_\_\_

2. The total amount of grazing receipts collected by your agency was?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ in 1982  
\$ \_\_\_\_\_ in 1983  
\$ \_\_\_\_\_ in 1984  
\$ \_\_\_\_\_ in 1985

3. The grazing fee charged by your agency was?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ per AUM or \$ \_\_\_\_\_ per Acre in 1982  
\$ \_\_\_\_\_ per AUM or \$ \_\_\_\_\_ per Acre in 1983  
\$ \_\_\_\_\_ per AUM or \$ \_\_\_\_\_ per Acre in 1984  
\$ \_\_\_\_\_ per AUM or \$ \_\_\_\_\_ per Acre in 1985

4. Grazing Statistics:

A. Total acres leased for grazing \_\_\_\_\_

B. Number of leased acres that are irrigated \_\_\_\_\_

C. Number of AUM's \_\_\_\_\_ (AUM's are Animal Unit Months)

5. Lease Statistics:

A. Number of separate leases \_\_\_\_\_

B. Number of separate leasees \_\_\_\_\_

FORM A - FEE DETERMINATION

(Include with Short Form mail questionnaire if telephone survey indicated a grazing policy change for fee determination)

1. What general method(s) best describe how your grazing fee is determined? (Mark all that apply)

(comments)

- \_\_\_\_ A. sealed bid \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ B. auction \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ C. set by a board or committee \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ D. based upon private lease rates in local area \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ E. negotiated between agency and rancher \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ F. set by formula \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ G. set by BLM or Forest Service Fees \_\_\_\_\_

2. How often is the general grazing fee revised for your agency?

Every \_\_\_\_\_ years.

3. Is obtaining a fair market price the primary objective in setting the fee rate?

Yes  No

4. If there are other factors considered in setting the fee, please indicate: (Mark all that apply)

- \_\_\_\_ A. ability of ranchers to pay
- \_\_\_\_ B. encourage the grazing of livestock
- \_\_\_\_ C. encourage local economies
- \_\_\_\_ D. other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

5. For each different method of fee determination (see question one) used by your agency complete only the appropriate sections A-F below.

A or B. Sealed Bid or Auction

1. Is there a minimum bid?  Yes  No

2. If there is a minimum bid, how is it determined? \_\_\_\_\_

(If minimum bid is determined by other methods shown in sections C-F, please respond to those questions and indicate "minimum bid determination")

3. Average number of participants bidding on each lease \_\_\_\_\_

4. Distribution of winning bias: \_\_\_\_\_

Range: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Low Bid \$ \_\_\_\_\_ High Bid

5. Show the typical fee rate and basis upon which it is charged:

\_\_\_\_\_ 1) \$ per AUM

\_\_\_\_\_ 2) \$ per acre

\_\_\_\_\_ 3) other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

6. Are any other items of value covered by the assessed fee?

\_\_\_\_\_ 1) crops

\_\_\_\_\_ 2) non-grazing items

\_\_\_\_\_ 3) other, specify all \_\_\_\_\_

7. What would the estimated fee be without any of the items listed in #6?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ per \_\_\_\_\_

C. Board or Committee Setting of Fee:

If the board simply approves a formula which is then applied routinely to set lease rates--please fill out the section F on formulas instead of this section.

1. List factors in order of importance that are considered in setting the fee:

- a. \_\_\_\_\_
- b. \_\_\_\_\_
- c. \_\_\_\_\_
- d. \_\_\_\_\_

2. Show the fee rate and basis upon which it is charged:

- 1) \$ per AUM
- 2) \$ per acre
- 3) other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

3. Are any other items of value covered by the assessed fee?

- 1) crops
- 2) non-grazing items
- 3) other, specify all \_\_\_\_\_

4. What would the estimated fee be without any of the items listed in #3.

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ per \_\_\_\_\_

D. Comparison with Private Lease Rates:

1. How is the comparable private lease rate ascertained?

---

---

2. List the factors in order of importance that are used to adjust the private lease rate to arrive at your agency's fee:

- a. \_\_\_\_\_
- b. \_\_\_\_\_
- c. \_\_\_\_\_
- d. \_\_\_\_\_

3. How often are private leases monitored to update the fee?

---

4. Show the typical fee rate and basis upon which it is charged:

- 1) \$ per AUM
- 2) \$ per acre
- 3) other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

5. Are any other items of value covered by the assessed fee?

- 1) crops
- 2) non-grazing items
- 3) other, specify all \_\_\_\_\_

6. What would the estimated fee be without any of the items listed in #5?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ per \_\_\_\_\_

E. Negotiation with the Rancher:

1. List the factors in order of importance that are considered during the renegotiation:

---

---

1. The number of years of lease duration.

2. Does the current renter have any fee rights upon renegotiation:

3. If the lease length is variable, list the factors which determine duration.

4. Show the typical fee rate and basis upon which it is charged:

Identified in the previous section and evidence will be shown.

1) \$ per AUM \_\_\_\_\_  
2) \$ per acre \_\_\_\_\_  
3) other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

5. Are any other items of value covered by the assessed fee?

Identified in the previous section and evidence will be shown.

1) crops \_\_\_\_\_  
2) non-grazing items \_\_\_\_\_  
3) other, specify all \_\_\_\_\_

6. What would the estimated fee be without any of the items listed in #4?

7. How is part of the lease fee set? (Mark all that apply.)

Identified in the previous section and evidence will be shown.

A. the present tenant has first right of refusal \_\_\_\_\_  
B. the present tenant competes on an equal basis \_\_\_\_\_  
C. other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

8. In the lease does the agency or the rancher set the following fees? (Mark all items A-F.)

Agency \_\_\_\_\_ Rancher \_\_\_\_\_ Both \_\_\_\_\_

- A. season of use \_\_\_\_\_  
B. grazing capacity \_\_\_\_\_  
C. length of use \_\_\_\_\_  
D. location of livestock \_\_\_\_\_  
E. sub-leasing \_\_\_\_\_  
F. other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

F. Set by a Formula:

1. What is the exact formula? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. How was this formula derived? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. Where and how are variables that update the formula determined?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4. Show the typical fee rate and basis upon which it is charged:  
\_\_\_\_ 1) \$ per AUM  
\_\_\_\_ 2) \$ per acre  
\_\_\_\_ 3) other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

5. Are any other items of value covered by the assessed fee?  
\_\_\_\_ 1) crops  
\_\_\_\_ 2) non-grazing items  
\_\_\_\_ 3) other, specify all \_\_\_\_\_

6. What would the estimated fee be without any of the items listed in #5?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ per \_\_\_\_\_

FORM B - LEASE RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS

(Include with Short Form mail questionnaire if telephone survey indicated a grazing policy change for lease right)

NOTE: This section should be completed separately for each of the following fee systems: sealed bid, auction, set by board or committee, based upon private lease rates, negotiated between agency and rancher, set by a formula, and set by BLM or Forest Service Fees.

1. The number of years of lease duration is \_\_\_\_\_ years.
  
  2. If the lease length is variable, list the factors which determine duration:
    - A. \_\_\_\_\_
    - B. \_\_\_\_\_
    - C. \_\_\_\_\_
  
  3. Does your agency set any requirements to qualify for a grazing lease? (Mark all that apply.)
    - A. ability to manage a livestock operation
    - B. residency
    - C. prior use
    - D. type of livestock, (explain) \_\_\_\_\_
    - E. other, (describe) \_\_\_\_\_
  
  4. How is renewal of the lease determined? (Mark all that apply.)
    - A. the present tenant has first right of refusal
    - B. the present tenant competes on an equal basis
    - C. other, specify \_\_\_\_\_
  
  5. In the lease does the agency or the rancher set the following items? (Mark all items A-F.)
- |                          | Agency | Rancher | Both  |
|--------------------------|--------|---------|-------|
| A. season of use         | _____  | _____   | _____ |
| B. grazing capacity      | _____  | _____   | _____ |
| C. length of use         | _____  | _____   | _____ |
| D. location of livestock | _____  | _____   | _____ |
| E. sub-leasing           | _____  | _____   | _____ |
| F. other (specify)       | _____  | _____   | _____ |

6. For the following categories of costs the agency or rancher assumes what proportion?

<u>Category</u>	<u>Agency Percentage</u>	<u>Rancher Percentage</u>
A. salting, minerals, supplemental feed		
B. livestock management		
C. maintenance of existing facilities (excludes purchase of new improvements)		
water facilities		
fence		
other, specify _____		
D. other, specify _____		

7. A. Does the grazing tenant in the lease have the right to:  
(Mark all that apply)

- \_\_\_\_ 1. control hunting and fishing
- \_\_\_\_ 2. control all access
- \_\_\_\_ 3. control vehicle access
- \_\_\_\_ 4. control predators
- \_\_\_\_ 5. use other resources, e.g., timber, water, etc.

- B. Does the grazing tenant have the right to charge for any of the above items?    
Yes                  No

8. If the lease is transferred from the present tenant to another, how are range improvements that have been financed by the present tenant exchanged?  
(Mark all that apply)

- \_\_\_\_ A. The present tenant is compensated by the agency
- \_\_\_\_ B. The present tenant is compensated by the new tenant
- \_\_\_\_ C. The present tenant is compensated by the agency and new tenant
- \_\_\_\_ D. No compensation is made
- \_\_\_\_ E. Moveable improvements are allowed to be removed
- \_\_\_\_ F. Moveable improvements are required to be removed

FORM C - EXPENDITURES AND RECEIPTS OF GRAZING FEES

(Include with Short Form mail questionnaire if telephone survey indicated a grazing policy change for expenditures and receipts of grazing fees)

1. What is the amount of the grazing receipts retained by your land administration agency for its use? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
2. If part of the grazing receipts are not retained by the agency, describe how they are distributed. \_\_\_\_\_
3. If funds from other sources are used for the grazing or range program, please answer the following:
  - A. What is the source of those funds and the amount?

Source	Amount (\$)
1. _____	_____
2. _____	_____
3. _____	_____
4. _____	_____

Source	Amount (\$)
1. _____	_____
2. _____	_____
3. _____	_____
4. _____	_____

F. Telephone Number of Contact Person \_\_\_\_\_

QUESTIONS ADDED ON GRAZING RECEIPTS AND PAYING FEES  
2. Grazing statistics:

- A. Total acres leased for grazing \_\_\_\_\_
- B. Number of leases after 1962 are leased \_\_\_\_\_
- C. Number of A.R.V.'s \_\_\_\_\_
- D. How many acres that you offer to lease could not be leased under the current lease arrangement and charged to 1962 and/or received \_\_\_\_\_

3. Lease statistics:

- A. Number of separate leases \_\_\_\_\_
- B. Number of separate leases \_\_\_\_\_
- C. Size of leases negotiated with range usually given \_\_\_\_\_

FORM D - RANGE IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURES

(EXCLUDES MAINTENANCE OR COSTS OF GRAZING)

(Include with Short Form mail questionnaire if telephone survey indicated a grazing policy change for range improvement expenditures)

1. How much total expenditure was made last year for range improvements?

	Total Dollars	Dollars Spent by Agency
A. fencing	_____	_____
B. water development	_____	_____
C. soil-vegetation improvement	_____	_____
D. other, specify _____	_____	_____

2. Was a rebate or discount on fees given on improvement expenditures?

Yes

No

3. If yes, how much?

**REVISIONS MARKED ON CENSUS SURVEY FORM**

OIB No. 0596-0072

Expires: October 31, 1983

## GRAZING LEASING ARRANGEMENTS AND USER CHARGES SURVEY

Please complete the following questions to the best of your knowledge. Response to this survey is voluntary and not required by law. However, your cooperation is very important to ensure timely and accurate information.

## I. GENERAL

1. Name and Location:

A. Agency Name \_\_\_\_\_

B. Agency Telephone Number (DELETED-ANSWER SAME AS PART F)  
Area Code - Number

C. Address \_\_\_\_\_

State

Zip Code

D. Please indicate government agency type     
Federal State Local

E. Name of Contact Person \_\_\_\_\_

F. Telephone Number of Contact Person \_\_\_\_\_

## 2. Grazing statistics:

A. Total acres leased for grazing

8. Number of leased acres that are irrigated \_\_\_\_\_

D. How many acres that you wish to lease could not be leased under the current lease arrangement and charges? (~~DELETED-ZERO ANSWERS RECEIVED~~)

### 3. Lease statistics:

A. Number of separate leases \_\_\_\_\_

B. Number of separate leasees \_\_\_\_\_

C. Size of leases (C ~~DELETED-VERY WIDE RANGE USUALLY GIVEN~~) \_\_\_\_\_.

### II. FEE DETERMINATION

\*\*\*\*\*

1. What general method(s) best describe how your grazing fee is determined? (Mark all that apply)

- A. sealed bid
- B. auction
- C. set by a board or committee
- D. based upon private lease rates in local area
- E. negotiated between agency and rancher
- F. set by a formula
- G. set by BLM or Forest Service Fees

(LINES ADDED HERE FOR DISCUSSION)

2. If grazing fees are arranged several different ways, please answer the following questions:

- A. List the factors in order of importance which determine which method is used.

1. \_\_\_\_\_

2. (ENTIRE QUESTION DELETED)

3. (DELETED=LOW RESPONSE AND ANSWERS CAN BE INCLUDED IN  
DISCUSSION SPACE ADDED TO QUESTION 1)

- B. What amount of the total grazing leased and amount of grazing fee revenue stem from each fee arrangement?

Fee Arrangement (Use letters A-F from question 1-1)	Total Grazing (Acres)	Total Fee Revenue (\$)
---	--------------------------	---------------------------

1. \_\_\_\_\_

2. (ENTIRE QUESTION DELETED)

3. (DELETED=INFORMATION COLLECTED IN LATER QUESTIONS)

4. \_\_\_\_\_

3. How often is a new grazing fee set? \_\_\_\_\_ years MODIFIED TO CLARIFY (SEE BELOW)

4. Is obtaining a fair market price the primary objective in setting the fee rate?

Yes

No

5. If there are other factors considered in setting the fee, please indicate: (Mark all that apply)

- A. ability of ranchers to pay
- B. encourage the grazing of livestock
- C. encourage local economies
- D. other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

3. HOW OFTEN IS A NEW GENERAL GRAZING FEE SET FOR YOUR AGENCY? \_\_\_\_\_ YEARS

6. FOR EACH DIFFERENT METHOD OF FEE DETERMINATION (SEE QUESTION II-1)  
USED BY YOUR AGENCY COMPLETE ONLY THE APPROPRIATE SECTIONS A-F BELOW

A. OR B. SEALED BID OR AUCTION

NEW QUESTION INSERTED  
SEE BELOW

1. Time(s) of year bids are let (DELETED DATA NOT USEFUL)

2. Average number of auctions per year (DELETED DATA NOT USEFUL)

3. Average number of participants \_\_\_\_\_

4. Distribution of winning bids:

Range: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Low bid      \$ \_\_\_\_\_ High bid

5. Show the typical fee rate and basis upon which it is charged:

\_\_\_\_ 1) \$ per AUM

\_\_\_\_ 2) \$ per acre

\_\_\_\_ 3) \$ per pound of livestock gain

\_\_\_\_ 4) \$ per cow-calf pair

\_\_\_\_ 5) \$ per head

\_\_\_\_ 6) fixed yearly fee of \$ \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_ 7) other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

6. Are any other items of value covered by the assessed fee?

\_\_\_\_ 1) crops

\_\_\_\_ 2) use of facilities

\_\_\_\_ 3) water rights

\_\_\_\_ 4) mineral rights

\_\_\_\_ 5) other, specify all \_\_\_\_\_

PARTS 3-7 DELETED  
NO RESPONSE

PARTS 2-4 DELETED  
NO RESPONSE

NEW PART ADDED, SEE BELOW

2) NON GRAZING ITEMS

7. What would the estimated fee be without any of the items listed in #6?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ per \_\_\_\_\_

1 IS THERE A MINIMUM BID? YES No

2 IF THERE IS A MINIMUM BID, HOW IS IT DETERMINED? \_\_\_\_\_

C. BOARD OR COMMITTEE SETTING OF FEE:

1. Is this the board's single most important function? ~~(DELETED-ANSWER ALWAYS NO)~~
2. List factors in order of importance that are considered in setting the fee:
  - a. \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. \_\_\_\_\_
3. Show the fee rate and basis upon which it is charged:
  - 1) \$ per AUM
  - 2) \$ per acre
  - 3) \$ per pound of livestock gain
  - 4) \$ per cow-calf pair
  - 5) \$ per head
  - 6) fixed yearly fee of \$ \_\_\_\_\_
  - 7) other, specify \_\_\_\_\_
4. Are any other items of value covered by the assessed fee?
  - 1) crops
  - 2) use of facilities
  - 3) water rights
  - 4) mineral rights
  - 5) other, specify all \_\_\_\_\_

(SEE MODIFICATION ON PAGE 3)

5. What would the estimated fee be without any of the items listed in #4?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ per \_\_\_\_\_

6. If a fee system is variable (varies among leases or individuals, etc.), list the factors that change the fee and by how much:

Factors	Amount \$	;
a. _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
b. _____ <i>(ENTIRE QUESTION DELETED)</i> <i>(DELETED-NO RESPONSE)</i>	_____	_____
c. _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
d. _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

D. COMPARISON WITH PRIVATE LEASE RATES:

1. How is the comparable private lease rate ascertained?

MORE SPACE PROVIDED

2. List the factors in order of importance that are used to adjust the private lease rate to arrive at your agency's fee:

- a. \_\_\_\_\_  
b. \_\_\_\_\_  
c. \_\_\_\_\_  
d. \_\_\_\_\_

3. How often are private leases monitored to update the fee?

4. Show the typical fee rate and basis upon which it is charged:

- 1) \$ per AUM  
 2) \$ per acre  
 3) \$ per pound of livestock gain  
 4) \$ per cow-calf pair  
 5) \$ per head  
 6) fixed yearly fee of \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 7) other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

5. Are any other items of value covered by the assessed fee?

- 1) crops  
 2) use of facilities  
 3) water rights  
 4) mineral rights  
 5) other, specify all \_\_\_\_\_

6. What would the estimated fee be without any of the items listed in #5?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ per \_\_\_\_\_

7. If a fee system is variable (varies among leases or individuals, etc.), list the factors that change the fee and by how much:

Factors	Amount \$	%
(ENTIRE QUESTION DELETED) (DELETED-NO RESPONSE)	_____	_____
b. _____	_____	_____
c. _____	_____	_____
d. _____	_____	_____

(SEE MODIFICATION ON PAGE 3)

(SEE MODIFICATION ON PAGE 3)

E. NEGOTIATION WITH THE RANCHER:

1. List the factors in order of importance that are considered during the renegotiation:

\_\_\_\_\_

2. Does the current renter have any fee rights upon renegotiation:

\_\_\_\_\_

3. Show the typical fee rate and basis upon which it is charged:

1) \$ per AUM

2) \$ per acre

3) \$ per pound of livestock gain

4) \$ per cow-calf pair

5) \$ per head

6) fixed yearly fee of \$ \_\_\_\_\_

7) other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

4. Are any other items of value covered by the assessed fee?

1) crops

2) use of facilities

3) water rights

4) mineral rights

5) other, specify all \_\_\_\_\_

5. What would the estimated fee be without any of the items listed in #4?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ per \_\_\_\_\_

6. If a fee system is variable (varies among leases or individuals, etc.), list the factors that change the fee and by how much:

Factors	Amount \$	%
a. _____	_____	_____
b. (ENTIRE QUESTION DELETED) (DELETED-NO RESPONSE)	_____	_____
c. _____	_____	_____
d. _____	_____	_____

F. SET BY A FORMULA:

1. What is the exact formula? \_\_\_\_\_  
(MORE SPACE PROVIDED)
2. How was this formula derived? \_\_\_\_\_  
(DELETED POOR QUESTION)
3. How is the base rate determined? \_\_\_\_\_
4. Where and how are variables that update the formula determined?  
\_\_\_\_\_
5. What is the formula supposed to accomplish? (DELETED-ALWAYS ANSWERED MAXIMIZE REVENUES)  
\_\_\_\_\_
6. Show the typical fee rate and basis upon which it is charged:  
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) \$ per AUM
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) \$ per acre
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) \$ per pound of livestock gain
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) \$ per cow-calf pair
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) \$ per head
  - \_\_\_\_ 6) fixed yearly fee of \$ \_\_\_\_\_
  - \_\_\_\_ 7) other, specify \_\_\_\_\_
7. Are any other items of value covered by the assessed fee?  
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) crops
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) use of facilities
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) water rights
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) mineral rights
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) other, specify all \_\_\_\_\_
8. What would the estimated fee be without any of the items listed in #7?  
\$ \_\_\_\_\_ per \_\_\_\_\_
9. If a fee system is variable (varies among leases or individuals, etc.), list the factors that change the fee and by how much:

Factors	Amount \$	%
a. _____	_____	_____
<u>(ENTIRE QUESTION DELETED)</u>		
b. <u>(DELETED-NO RESPONSE)</u>	_____	_____
c. _____	_____	_____
d. _____	_____	_____

III. LEASE RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS: (This section is to be completed for each fee system - see A-F in question II-1 your agency uses.)

1. The number of years or lease duration is \_\_\_\_\_
2. If the lease length is variable, list the factors which determine duration:
  - A. \_\_\_\_\_
  - B. \_\_\_\_\_
  - C. \_\_\_\_\_
3. Does your agency set any requirements to qualify for a grazing lease? (Mark all that apply)
  - A. ~~COMPENSATE PROPERTY~~ ABILITY TO MANAGE LIVESTOCK OPERATION
  - B. residency QUESTION CHANGED TO REPRESENT ACTUAL QUALIFYING REQUIREMENTS
  - C. prior use
  - D. type of livestock, (explain) \_\_\_\_\_
  - E. other, (describe) \_\_\_\_\_
4. Is there any limit as to the amount of grazing any one person can lease?  Yes  No If so, how much? \_\_\_\_\_
5. How is renewal of the lease determined? (Mark all that apply)
  - A. ~~EXPRESSLY EXCLUDED~~ POOR QUESTION
  - B. the present tenant has first right of refusal
  - C. the present tenant competes on an equal basis
  - D. other, specify \_\_\_\_\_
6. What are the terms of payment? (Mark all that apply)
  - A. full payment in advance for term of lease
  - B. annual payment at the end of grazing season
  - C. (DELETED DATA NOT USEFUL) payment at beginning of grazing season
  - D. annual payment on lease anniversary
  - E. monthly payment
  - F. other (explain) \_\_\_\_\_
7. In the lease does the agency or the rancher set the following items? (Mark all items A - D)

	Agency	Rancher	Both
A. season of use	_____	_____	_____
B. <del>number of livestock/acre</del> GRAZING CAPACITY	_____	_____	(REWORDING)
C. length of use	_____	_____	_____
D. location of livestock	_____	_____	_____
E. Sub-leasing	_____	_____	_____
F. <del>owner of livestock</del>	_____	_____	_____
G. <del>number of units of lvsck</del> F.H.I ALWAYS ANSWERED "RANCHER"	_____	_____	_____
H. <del>livestock management</del>	_____	_____	_____
J. OTHER (specify)	_____	_____	_____

8. A. Does the grazing tenant in the lease have the right to:  
(Mark all that apply)

- 1. control hunting or fishing
- 2. control all access
- 3. control vehicle access
- 4. ~~control~~ CONTROL PREDATORS
- 5. use other resources, e.g., timber water, etc.

-271-

ONLY PREDATOR WILDLIFE  
IS SUBJECT TO TENANT  
CONTROL USUALLY

B. Does the grazing tenant have the right to charge for any of the

above items?  Yes  No

9. If the lease is transferred from the present tenant to another, how are range improvements that have been financed by the present tenant exchanged? (Mark all that apply)

- A. The present tenant is compensated by the agency
- B. The present tenant is compensated by the new tenant
- C. The present tenant is compensated by the agency and new tenant
- D. No compensation is made
- E. Moveable improvements are allowed to be removed
- F. ~~Moveable~~ improvements are required to be removed

(UNDERLINES ARE NEW)

10. For the following categories of costs the agency or rancher assumes what proportion?

TYPO

Category	Agency Percentage	Rancher Percentage
A. Salting, minerals, supplemental feed	_____	_____
B. <del>Herding</del> livestock management	_____	_____
C. Maintenance	_____	_____
water facilities	_____	_____
fence	_____	_____
other, specify _____	_____	_____
D. <del>Transportation of</del> <del>livestock</del>	(ALWAYS RANCHER) _____	_____
E. <del>Veterinary</del> _____	(ALWAYS RANCHER) _____	_____
F. Other, specify _____	_____	_____

REWORDING

11. Of the above items (in question 10), which ones are set by the lease system and/or fee systems?

	Lease set	Fee set
A.	_____	_____
B.	_____	_____
C.	(ENTIRE QUESTION DELETED)	_____
D.	(DELETED=NO RESPONSE)	_____
E.	_____	_____
F.	Other _____	_____
1.	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____

IV. EXPENDITURES AND RECEIPTS OF GRAZING FEES

1. The total amount of grazing fees collected by your agency last year was?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

(DELETED-ANSWERED ELSEWHERE)

2. What is the amount of the grazing ~~revenues~~ retained by your land administration agency for its use? \$ RECEIPTS

REWORDING

3. If part of the grazing fees are not retained by the agency, describe how they are distributed. X X RECEIPTS

4. Is there a fixed proportion of the grazing fees collected that is distributed to:

(\$ or %)

- A. Range or grazing division \_\_\_\_\_
- B. Field supervision or oversight \_\_\_\_\_
- C. Range improvements \_\_\_\_\_
- D. Other range or grazing programs, specify \_\_\_\_\_

(DELETED-NO RESPONSE)

5. If funds from other sources are used ~~to administer~~ the grazing or range program, please answer the following:

ADMINISTER IS TOO NARROW A DESCRIPTIVE

A. What is the source of those funds and the amount?

Source	Amount (\$)
1. _____	_____
2. _____	_____
3. _____	_____
4. _____	_____

B. Are the funds a steady flow:  Yes  No OR meant to

(PART B DELETED-NO RESPONSE) fill in as needed when grazing fees are not adequate?  Yes  No

C. Are these funds earmarked for any special program?

Program	Amount (\$)	%
1. Range or grazing division	_____	_____
2. Field supervision or oversight	_____	_____
3. Range improvements	_____	_____
4. Other, specify _____	_____	_____

(PART A DELETED-NO RESPONSE)

V. RANGE IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURES (EXCLUDES MAINTENANCE OR COSTS OF GRAZING)

(USUALLY ONLY AGENCY DOLLARS ARE KNOWN AND PERCENT IS UNKNOWN)

1. How much expenditure was made last year for range improvements?

TOTAL	Dollars	X by Landlord	DOLLARS BY AGENCY
A. Fencing	_____	_____	_____
B. Water development	_____	_____	_____
C. Soil-vegetation improvement	_____	_____	_____
D. Other, specify _____	_____	_____	_____

2. ~~How AS~~ A rebate or discount on fees ~~is~~ given improvement expenditures? \_\_\_\_\_

3. ~~If so, how much?~~ When permanent improvements are installed:

REWORDING

- A. Who has legal ownership of the movable (improvement) facilities

(e.g., tanks)?  Tenant  Landlord

~~(ENTIRE QUESTION DELETED)~~

~~(DELETED DATA NOT USEFUL)~~

- B. Who has legal ownership of non-movable improvements (e.g., spraying)?

Tenant  Landlord

- C. How is the resulting increase in carrying capacity allocated?

Tenant  Landlord

4. Are lease terms altered if the tenant participates in improvement cost?

- A. Can lease be terminated before useful life of improvement expires?

~~(ENTIRE QUESTION DELETED)~~

~~(DELETED DATA NOT USEFUL)~~

- B. Does compensation have to be made to tenant if lease is terminated?

- C. In what way are lease contracts rewritten? \_\_\_\_\_

VI. POLICY CHANGES

\*\*\*\*\*

1. Has your agency altered its grazing policy since ~~1970~~ <sup>1981</sup>?  No  Yes  
If yes, please indicate policy changes and the year of change.

Policy Change	Year of Change		
	19__	19__	19__
A. Fee determination			
1. method of fee determination			
2. variable fee system			
3. items included			
4. rate basis			
5. other			
B. Lease policy			
1. duration of lease			
2. qualification for lease			
3. <del>limits of acreage amount</del>			
4. <del>rental rights</del>			
5. lease management			
6. other use management			
7. range improvement transfer			
8. <del>lease terms</del>			
9. other			
C. Expenditures and receipts			
1. percentage retained			
2. <del>percentage of non-retained fees</del>			
3. distribution of retained fees			
4. sources of non-fee funds			
5. other			
D. Range improvements			
1. amounts of range improvement			
2. rebate or discounts on <del>range</del> IMPROVEMENTS			
3. ownership of improvements			
4. lease terms and improvements			
5. other			
E. Costs of grazing			
1. <del>costs of grazing</del>			
2. <del>costs of grazing</del>			
3. <del>costs of grazing</del>			
4. <del>other</del>			

2. What was the reason for the policy change?

- A. Reason for fee policy change \_\_\_\_\_
- B. Reason for lease policy change \_\_\_\_\_
- C. Reason for expenditure and receipt policy change \_\_\_\_\_
- D. Reason for range improvements policy change \_\_\_\_\_
- E. Reason for costs of grazing policy change \_\_\_\_\_

Bureau of Land Management  
Library  
Bldg. 50, Denver Federal Center  
Denver, CO 80225

